

PROCEEDINGS



2006 NCAA®
Convention Proceedings

100th Annual Convention
January 6-9, 2006
Indianapolis, Indiana

PROCEEDINGS



2006 NCAA®
Convention Proceedings

100th Annual Convention
January 6-9, 2006
Indianapolis, Indiana



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222
317/917-6222
www.ncaa.org
May 2006

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

©2006 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association

Opening Business Session

Saturday, January 7, 2006

The 100th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 4 p.m. by Walter Harrison, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harrison: I have been waiting for this for a long time. Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the opening session of the 2006 NCAA Convention. I am Walter Harrison, president of the University of Hartford, and chair of the NCAA Executive Committee. I have the pleasure of moderating this historic opening session and welcoming you to Indianapolis as we join together to celebrate the NCAA Centennial.

As you go about your business at the Convention, you will see many communication platforms, including television, print and outdoor advertising, that celebrate 100 years of the student-athlete and brings attention to the unique values of what President Myles Brand has described as the collegiate model of athletics.

Speaking of President Brand, whom we will hear from in a few minutes, it is my pleasure to introduce now Dr. Myles Brand, NCAA president. (Applause)

With me today on the dais are the chairs of the Divisions I, II and III presidential governing bodies. I am pleased to welcome at your far left: Phil Austin, University of Connecticut, chair of the Division I Board of Directors; Kathryn Martin, University of Minnesota Duluth, chair of the Division II Presidents Council; and Phillip Stone, Bridgewater College of Virginia, chair of the Division III Presidents Council. We are fortunate that Phil Austin will continue to serve as the chair of the Division I Board of Directors for another year, and especially fortunate that he is here today when not one but two of his basketball teams are on national television. Thanks for joining us, Phil. However, Divisions II and III will have new leadership in 2006.

I would like to take this occasion to commend Kathryn Martin and Phil Stone for their leadership. Based on the knowledge that they have exhibited in leading their respective divisions, I know Kathryn and Phil will continue to remain involved in our Association activities. I ask you now to please join me in thanking them for their service to the Association. (Applause)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

It has been the tradition during the opening business session that the NCAA honors athletics staff members and student-athletes who died during this past year with a Memorial Resolutions report. The NCAA is recognizing the individuals who have died by listing their names in the Convention Program. The communication was sent to all directors of athletics and conference commissioners with an electronic link to the NCAA Web site for names of individuals from an institution or conference who died during 2005. The NCAA News publishes notice of those deaths in each issue.

I would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance we receive each year from NCAA staff members Sharon Tufano and Leilana McKindra in compiling this list.

At this time, I would like to ask you to turn to Pages 5 through 9 of your Convention Program to see the names of those institutional staff members associated with athletics and student-athletes who died in 2005.

I ask the delegates and our friends from the media to please stand now and observe a moment of silence for those men and women who have passed away since we last met.

[The assembly stood in a moment of silence.]

Thank you very much. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact any member of the national office staff.

Many lives were touched by the Hurricane Katrina disaster earlier this year. I want to take a moment to thank and salute the entire Association for our collective efforts through the giving of time, money and compassion. Thank you to all our member institutions that embraced displaced students, student-athletes, faculty and staff.

Thanks also goes to the national office staff for helping ease the process for those affected by this tragic national disaster. It is comforting to know that in times of need, our organization is truly an Association of one, as demonstrated by our collective actions.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It is customary at this point in the opening business session for the chair to present the report of the NCAA Executive Committee, and I will do so briefly. As many of you know, the NCAA federated governance structure allows each division the autonomy to address its various issues.

However, it is important for us to keep in mind that we gather annually at this Convention as one Association. The NCAA Executive Committee is composed of 16 presidents and chancellors from three divisions, the president of the NCAA and three non-voting members—the chairs of the Management Councils in Divisions I, II and III.

The Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities include approval of the Association's budget, oversight of Association-wide issues, initiation and settlement of litigation, and the employment of the NCAA president.

With that in mind, I would like to report briefly on what has been a busy and productive year for the Association. At the April 28 meeting in Indianapolis, the Executive Committee took a strong stance on Title IX with the adoption of a resolution that urges the U.S. Department of Education to rescind its March 17 additional clarification for Title IX.

The Executive Committee also urged NCAA members to decline use of the procedures set forth in the additional clarification. I would like to note that the NCAA resolution also was unanimously supported by the Divisions I, II and III presidential bodies that met before the Executive Committee.

In August, the Executive Committee approved an agreement with the Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association (MIBA) that allowed the NCAA to purchase the rights to and operate the preseason and postseason National Invitation Tournaments, concluding a four-year legal battle. The agreement both transferred the ownership of the tournaments and ended the litigation. This was a historic opportunity for college basketball.

After years of study and debate, the presidents and chancellors on the NCAA Executive Committee approved in August a series of recommendations in the spirit of the Association's core principles on diversity and in conclusion limit the use of Native American mascots, nicknames and imagery at future NCAA championships.

The decision reached during the Executive Committee's August 4 meeting in Indianapolis is part of a new policy to prohibit NCAA colleges and universities from displaying hostile or abusive racial, ethnic or national origin mascots, nicknames or imagery at any of the 88 NCAA championships.

I would point out that the policy governs championship participation and hosting opportunities only, and does not preclude an institution from autonomously selecting and using a mascot or nickname of its choice during regular-season in-conference competition.

The Association supports the concept of institutional autonomy and recognizes the right and responsibility of each institution to address these issues at the campus level. However, consistent with the Association's core principles pertaining to cultural diversity, ethical sportsmanship and non-discrimination, the Executive Committee's policy reinforces the belief that stereotyping Native Americans through nicknames and imagery is wrong. The Executive Committee established a review process for institutions to be exempted from the restrictions as set forth in the policy.

The basis of those exemptions reflected a commitment to maintaining a balance between the interest of a particular Native American tribe and our responsibility to ensure an atmosphere of respect and sensitivity for all who attend and participate in our championships. However, we recognize that there are many points of view associated with this issue, and that some Native American groups support the use of mascots and imagery and some do not.

Under the review process, all circumstances are being reviewed. All decisions by the review committee are appealable to the Executive Committee. These highlights illustrate the success of NCAA restructuring in providing greater clarity of authority as to where and how decisions are made within the Association and how it cre-

ated a structure whereby presidents and chancellors have primary responsibility for governing the Association.

The Executive Committee remains committed to its duties and taking a leadership role in determining and advancing Association initiatives on behalf of the membership. It challenges the governance structure to support the Association's priorities and its work on behalf of the membership and thousands of student-athletes.

Now, it is my pleasure to introduce NCAA President Myles Brand to present our State of the Association Address. Please join me in welcoming President Myles Brand. (Applause)

STATE OF ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

President Brand: Good afternoon.

We have all heard the story.

The 1905 football season resulted in 18 deaths and 149 serious injuries, at a time when there were far fewer college teams playing. The public was outraged, and rightly so.

President Theodore Roosevelt summoned the leadership of Harvard, Princeton, Yale and other football powerhouses to the White House to press the point that the sport had become too violent. Roosevelt was a man who advocated for the vigorous life and who was favorably inclined towards sports; but college football had simply become unsafe.

"Fix it or end it," he said.

After some wrangling by the sports community, Henry MacCraken, chancellor of New York University, called together the entire leadership of the football-playing schools, which numbered more than 60. From this conference, and with the strong leadership of Capt. Palmer Pierce of the U.S. Military Academy, a new organization was born—the Intercollegiate Athletics Association of the United States. Its purpose was to oversee college sports. Some years later the name was changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, best known today by its initials "NCAA."

Today, with this opening business session, the NCAA begins its Centennial celebration. Our first century is in the books.

Just to put the NCAA Centennial in perspective, consider these other birth dates. Oklahoma did not become a state until 1907; the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) wasn't founded until 1920; the first winter Olympics weren't held until 1924, the same year of the first Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade; and the first Oscars were not awarded until 1927.

Several key ideas were embodied in the founding of the NCAA, which persist today. The games are college athletics events, played under the auspices of America's institutions of higher education. The ultimate responsibility for intercollegiate athletics lies with the university leadership, the presidents and chancellors. The games are to be conducted in a fair way, with integrity, and one that attends to the safety and well-being of the students who participate. And there needs to be a neutral, objective governing body to provide operational oversight.

Those were the bedrock principles of 1906, and they are the bedrock principles of 2006.

I will not try to summarize the rich and complex history of college sports over the 100 years since the founding of the NCAA. Suffice it to say that its evolution took many turns, often because of the changing external environment, but sometimes because of power struggles within the college sports community.

During this period, one central point became clear. Sports, especially college sports, both shape and are shaped by American culture. Who we are as Americans, our attitudes and ambitions, our beliefs and interests, are influenced by the role of sports in society. We are the only country in the world that integrates sports with education at the secondary and collegiate levels. With the growth of women's sports and with the immense popularity of sports for the broadcast media, the competitive framework of sports pervades virtually all that we do.

Some applaud the infusion of sports in our culture; others decry it; and still others barely notice. But the fact of the matter is that what began 100 years ago in the marriage of sports with college, is as American and as celebrated by Americans as apple pie and the Fourth of July.

Given the relationship between sports and culture, it behooves us to get it right. The NCAA—the voice and conscience of college sports—has a distinctive obligation for normative leadership; leadership that is value-based.

The NCAA, of course, does not have the luxury to redesign the enterprise from scratch. We inherit the history of college sports, and we represent those who are engaged in it—coaches and administrators, certainly—but most especially those who participate, the student-athletes. We must all be singularly aware that college sports does not exist in a vacuum, a Platonic heaven, so to speak, uninfluenced by the dynamics of the real world. The popularity of college sports, with its attendant serious financial interests, affects what we can and should do.

We need to better understand what it is we have wrought. To be the voice and conscience of college sports, to be true to the intent of those in our universities who founded our organization and continue to provide leadership, and yet to be appropriately pragmatic, we need a conceptual framework for college sports that is inspirational, value-based, but realistic. And a Centennial is an appropriate milestone in which to reaffirm the underlying structure. I have been calling this framework “The Collegiate Model of Athletics.”

In the past, I have tried to differentiate the collegiate model from other models. Today, I will try to articulate its central principles. Armed with this framework, we can begin to look ahead to the future of intercollegiate athletics, how we might be affected by it and how we might influence its directions. Clearly there are forces beyond our control that affect intercollegiate athletics in substantive ways; but we are not without influence, and we must exercise that influence with forethought and care.

There are three key principles that constitute the collegiate model, namely one that pertains to the participants, the contests, and the enterprise as a whole.

Principle No 1—Those who participate in intercollegiate athletics are to be students attending a university or college.

Principle No. 2—Intercollegiate athletics contests are to be fair, conducted with integrity, and the safety and well-being of those who participate are paramount.

Principle No. 3—Intercollegiate athletics is to be wholly embedded in universities and colleges.

These first principles—these axioms—should dictate the fundamental nature of college sports. I will examine them in detail.

Principle No. 1—The participants. The collegiate model rests on the principle that those who participated are university and college students. It is a student-centered enterprise. Student-athletes come first. This is the heart of the matter.

Since the participants in college sports are students—individuals whose first order of business is acquiring an education—their academic success is of central importance. You have all heard our refrain, “There are 360,000 student-athletes, and almost all of them will go pro in something other than sports.” Those who participate in our games are the future doctors, lawyers, teachers, business people and elected officials. They are the future family members and community leaders. A few will play professional sports; but they, too, should receive an education at our fine universities and colleges. The fact of the matter is that a college education is the best preparation for a successful, fulfilling, happy life, and acquiring that education should be primary.

Understanding the importance of education in the lives of student-athletes, presidents, conference commissioners, directors of athletics, coaches, faculty representatives and athletics administrators have committed themselves to providing genuine opportunities to college athletes to receive an education. While that has no doubt been a goal in the past, there is a recent redoubling of effort. The result has been nothing less than the beginning of a dramatic reform focused on academic achievement.

The goals of this comprehensive reform effort have been to bring to campus freshmen who are better prepared to do college level work while increasing access to higher education, and to move enrolled student-athletes toward a degree—not just keep them eligible.

The central idea of this academic reform in Division I is to emphasize the importance of team academic performance, thereby involving both the leadership of coaches and peer pressure. The details of these reform efforts have been well documented, and I will not take the time to reiterate them here. The new standards, new matrix and new sanctions will improve academic performance across all divisions and all sports. At the same time, anyone who has thought seriously about changing behavior understands that there must also be positive reinforcements. The Division I Committee on Academic Performance is in the process of detailing the procedures for sanctions and articulating a program of incentives.

Fairness in implementation of sanctions requires a carefully nuanced set of specific rules and a timely waiver process. There is too much variability among sports and institutions, and too many special circumstances for there to be only a few simple, high-level rules. The committee, the NCAA staff and Board of Directors are working to ensure that the waivers for specific cases and exceptions to the general rules do not undermine the goals of this academic reform.

Divisions II and III are engaged in similar reform efforts with the common goal to ensure that every student-athlete in every sport has a genuine opportunity for a full and fine college education. In athletics, good enough is never good enough. Coaches and student-athletes alike strive to maximize their athletics performance. Similarly, we want every student-athlete to realize his or her full academic potential. Good enough academically also fails to be good enough. Given the discipline, the motivation to achieve, and the level of academic support we expect—and student-athletes should expect of themselves—high levels of academic performance.

The academic reform movement should not only raise the floor, but also raise the level of academic performance for all student-athletes. Increasing academic performance will continue to be an emphasis for our future.

There is another aspect of the first principle—the participant—that deserves attention as we move into our second century. Critics of college sports never tire of asking why we do not pay college athletes. Blogs and talk radio almost assume that college athletes should be paid—if not every athlete, then at least those stars who attract thousands to the stadiums and millions to televised games.

Sometimes, in response, pragmatic issues are brought forward. Can we legally, or in practice, pay only some of the participants? Does, for example, Title IX raise the potential for litigation? Do universities have the funds to do so, given that the large majority of universities are already subsidizing intercollegiate athletics?

Though these pragmatic issues raise problems for compensating college athletes, they can, I presume, be resolved if we wanted to compensate participants.

The fundamental reason we do not pay student-athletes to play is because they are students. This commitment is captured in the first principle of the collegiate model. The participants in intercollegiate athletics are students. They are not, in their roles as athletes, employees of the university. They are students who participate in athletics as part of their educational experience. This is the heart of the enterprise.

Today's iteration of intercollegiate athletics often is criticized for having abandoned the concept of amateurism to commercialism and big paychecks, while failing to include student-athletes in the perceived financial bonanza. The problem is we have romanticized the concept of amateurism as an unobtainable cross between its roots and the class distinctions of 19th century England, where sport was to be reserved for those whose wealth permitted participation as a leisure activity, and a halcyon ideal that college sports can operate without commercial support and indifferent to the realities of a modern business model.

I will address this latter point in greater detail in a moment, but in the end, the best way to articulate the collegiate model is to emphasize the initial principle, that those who participate in college sports are regular students. Anything else is professional sports.

Principle No. 2—The contest. The second principle of the collegiate model pertains to the contest, that is, the games and competitions. Tracing back our roots to the founding of the NCAA, these contests must respect the health and well-being of the students who participate. No more flying-wedge formations or their modern day equivalents. In addition, these contests must also demonstrate integrity. They must be fair.

These are the two central values underlying the second principle: student-athletes' well-being and integrity.

The integrity of the game requires, to use a metaphor, a level playing field. That means no team or individual participant is permitted an unfair advantage. It is the skill, strategy and hard work of the team and each player that determines the victory. Rules must be established to ensure fairness and they must be enforced.

The NCAA has the key role in establishing and enforcing the rules. And by the NCAA, I mean the Association. Rules are set not by the NCAA staff, but by representatives of the membership.

Unfortunately, to ensure that no one receives a perceived advantage, whether or not it is an actual advantage, rules have proliferated and become complex. Member representatives, not to mention the media and the public, complain about the proliferation and complexity of the rules. But then these same representatives spend innu-

merable hours setting new rules. This year alone Division I has well over 100 new rules in progress—each put forward by the membership.

Critics argue that personal responsibility should reign, and most of the rules, and the rule-making process, should be eliminated. But the problem is that some of those engaged in college sports do not always trust others to act with self-restraint and not take advantage of the situation for their own benefit. Their trust has been diminished, frankly, by the lessons of experience.

Human nature being what it is, I do not think that there will be, or can be, an agreement among all parties to eliminate or even greatly simplify the rules and trust all parties to act responsibly. Nonetheless, improvement of the current level of rule prolongation is possible. Over the next few years, let us all think carefully about how best to delimit rule making and to build the underlying trust that is necessary for integrity.

The NCAA staff has worked diligently to be more flexible and considerate in the application of its rules when they are broken inadvertently and when they do not create major competitive advantages. We have been particularly attentive to giving student-athletes the benefit of the doubt when they are not at fault or when their actions are inadvertent.

However, in the case of major infractions, we will be “tough as nails.” The NCAA has nearly doubled the number of enforcement investigators and we decreased by half the average time it takes us to develop major infractions cases. The national office is completing an extensive external review of our infractions processes. This review, which will be made public shortly, will confirm our overall approach, while recommending a number of changes to ensure quality control.

Principle No. 3—The college athletics enterprise. The third principle that defines the collegiate model of athletics concerns the enterprise as a whole. The central point is that intercollegiate athletics is embedded, is part of, the university. That is the most fundamental principle of the collegiate model. Everything else rests on it.

One critical consequence of this principle is that intercollegiate athletics inherits its values from the university. The same values that underlie the modern American university and college ought to underlie their athletics programs.

Our universities take pride in being meritocracies in which success depends on hard work and natural ability, and not on factors such as race, gender, religion or ethnic background. Universities are places where each and every person is to be respected. This ideal is not always recognized, not to mention adopted in our society—certainly not historically, and not today. Universities take it upon themselves not only to educate future generations to this ideal, but to promote it and exemplify it on campus, and that should, of course, include the athletics department.

We expect merit will determine who will play and who will lead. Coaches put the best players on the floor, independently of race and ethnic background. But coaches and athletics administrators themselves are not always selected, it would appear, entirely on their merits.

Though there has been some modest recent progress, there is an intolerable lack of head football coaches who are African-Americans in Divisions I, II and III, including especially the high-profile Division I-A level. There is an egregious lack of women and minority athletics directors and conference commissioners in all divisions. While I do not have all the answers to this frustrating problem, it is clear that we must do a better job in recruiting and selecting persons to these leadership positions.

Diversity and inclusion are the values of the university. They also must be the values and practices of intercollegiate athletics programs.

The Black Coaches Association (BCA) has created an annual report card to assess the openness and fairness in the hiring process. After two years' data, it is clear that some schools do considerably better than others during the search process. I support the efforts of the BCA to change the means by which coaches are selected. I support, too, in the strongest way, the efforts by a number of groups, both inside and outside the NCAA, who emphasize the vital importance that women gain opportunities for leadership positions in college athletics.

To better address these issues in the membership, the NCAA recently created the office of diversity and inclusion. Over the next several years, we can expect that office to identify ways in which the NCAA can better assist universities in the hiring of women and people of color into leadership positions and to prepare those who

in the future will move into these positions. But we also must produce an inclusive climate that seeks out divergent opinions and experiences that we go beyond a “head-count exercise” and get to the real goal—full involvement in the decision-making process.

As we identify specific barriers to success for women and people of color to leadership positions, we will take appropriate steps to correct the problem. For example, women face difficulty in balancing home and work responsibilities. I am pleased to announce that we are appointing a task force to address this issue of balancing work and home responsibilities for women athletics administrators and coaches. We anticipate productive recommendations from this task force in the near future.

Title IX has been influential in opening up post-baccalaureate education to women in the professions, including medicine, law and business. As we all know, this federal law also applies to college athletics. While there has been good progress in increasing the participation rate of women in college sports—five-fold since its passage in 1972—much remains to be accomplished. Young women still do not have the same proportion of participation opportunities as young men.

As I have said in the past, Title IX is one of the most important pieces of civil-rights legislation in the second half of the 20th century affecting higher education. We must—all of us—do all that we possibly can to protect Title IX from those who seek to weaken or destroy it, and to advocate for it to the very best of our ability.

In the university, the lead decision-maker, under the oversight of the institution’s board, is the president or chancellor. By extension, the lead decision-makers of the membership-driven NCAA are the university and college presidents.

The exercise of presidential leadership has varied over the history of the Association. But starting in the 1990s, and encouraged by a seminal report of the Knight Commission, presidents became again more involved in the direction of the NCAA.

This change of role for the presidents is having some effects on the NCAA governance systems. In Division III, it has resulted in a set of academic reforms, with some push back from others who do not share the president’s perspective. In Division II, it has led to a reframing of the mission of the division, driven by 140 of the division’s presidents who came together in a summit last June. In Division I, the result has been some minor changes in the way new legislation is processed, and, perhaps, a sense that some governance restructuring is warranted. The overall goal in any such governance change is to ensure that the presidents are adequately informed by the expert and experienced members of the athletics community in making their decisions.

The Division I presidents have certainly been active in academic reform. To effect strategic directions in complementary areas, I initiated a task force, consisting of nearly 50 presidents and chancellors.

The Division I Presidential Task Force on the Future of Intercollegiate Athletics was created to bring presidential leadership to important strategic issues. This task force and similar bodies do not pass legislation—that remains within the purview of the governance bodies; rather, they recommend future directions for action. These task forces help set the agenda. In the case of the Division I Presidential Task Force, that discussion already has begun. In fact, at this Convention, the several subcommittees of the task force are presenting their early and preliminary findings to obtain feedback before taking the next steps.

Let me return to one final major issue that pertains to the third principle of the collegiate model, namely, the underlying financial structure of intercollegiate athletics. There is significant misunderstanding of not only the financial model for athletics, but how it mirrors the approach for the rest of higher education.

Despite differences among the divisions in grants-in-aid, fan bases and expenditure levels, and despite variations within divisions among conferences and institutions within conferences, the underlying business plan for all athletics programs is basically the same. That business plan, moreover, is basically the same as the university as a whole.

It is this: Universities attempt to maximize their revenues and redistribute their resources according to their educational mission. Universities are nonprofit corporations, and as such, they do not generate profits for private owners or shareholders. But they do have an obligation to generate significant amounts of revenue to pursue their mission.

The sources of revenues for universities are primarily federal funds, and for public universities, state funds,

student tuition and fees; sale of services, such as room and board; philanthropic gifts and earnings from them; and sometimes corporate gifts and collaborations. It is critical to note that those areas that generate revenue are not necessarily the ones that spend it.

As an old philosophy professor, I recognized the fact that my department expended more revenue than it generated through student enrollment. I was well aware that the graduate program depended not only on undergraduate tuition, but also on money generated by other areas, such as service courses in English, math and the social sciences. The basic business plan for the university is one of massive redistribution of revenues on the basis of the institution's mission and strategic directions. There is nothing wrong with this financial approach; indeed, without it, the modern, comprehensive university as we know it, could not exist.

On a smaller but similar scale, the business plan for the athletics department mirrors that of the university. Revenue is maximized to meet the mission and strategic emphasis of the department. Athletics departments accrue far more revenue, as a proportion of their budget, from sales of tickets and media rights than the rest of the university.

In Divisions I and II, tuition cost is an athletics department expenditure that is paid into the general university fund rather than being a revenue source. In almost every case, the athletics department receives some subsidy from the university, either directly or indirectly through student fees or relief from some costs.

But generally speaking, there is no difference in the business plan between the athletics department and the university. Revenues from all sources are redistributed to provide participation opportunities in a broad range of sports.

In Division I, the revenue sports—most often only football and men's basketball—generate resources that are needed to conduct all the other sports in the program. The goal is to maximize the number of student-athletes participating at a competitive level across sports. This is the goal because athletics participation enhances the educational experience of students, and the institution's goal is to provide the best educational experience to the greatest number of enrolled students.

This is critical to understanding the relationship of athletics to higher education, and it bears repeating. We want to maximize the number of student-athletes competing at a competitive level, and we do this because athletics participation enhances the educational experience and enhancing the educational experience of students is the goal of higher education. That is the collegiate model of athletics.

This is the reason that divisions have requirements for a minimum number of sports, rather than simply permitting institutions to mount only the one or two revenue sports.

Let me put it provocatively. Athletics, like the university as a whole, seeks to maximize revenue. In this respect, it has an obligation to conduct its revenue-generating activities in a productive and sound business-like manner. Anything less would be incompetence at best and malfeasance at worst.

That is, on the revenue side, the in-put side, athletics, like the university itself, must follow the best business practices. On the expenditure side, the out-put side, as it were, athletics must follow its nonprofit mission. Like the university as a whole, athletics must maximize the best experiences of the students, including maximizing the number of participation opportunities.

None of this should be surprising. In the case of professional sports, there also is an attempt to maximize revenues, for example through ticket and media rights sales. But on the out-put side, the mission of professional sports is to maximize the bottom line, to maximize profits for the owners.

Professional sports has no obligation to redistribute revenues for other purposes, no matter the social value of those purposes—in fact, it has a *prima facie* obligation not to redistribute revenues.

So while intercollegiate athletics is often criticized for looking like professional sports on the in-put side—generating revenue—it is rarely understood that intercollegiate athletics and higher education behave like classic nonprofits on the out-put side in the way they redistribute those revenues to support their missions. The business of college sports is not a necessary evil; rather, it is a proper part of the overall enterprise.

There are cautionary tales to consider and danger of a different kind lurking. We must not let the interest in “business” of college sports become so alluring or enticing that it diverts us from the primary purpose of intercollegiate athletics—providing athletics opportunities for students that enhance their academic experience. We

must never lose sight of the academic purpose while we are conducting the necessary business of college sports.

The third principle, however, places a crucial constraint on how an athletics department functions in generating revenues. By being embedded in institutions of higher education, intercollegiate athletics departments inherit their values from their universities. The business activities of the athletics department must be informed and be in conformity with the values of the university, and higher education in general.

Commercial activity, meaning, for example, the sale of broadcast rights and logo licensing, is not only acceptable, but mandated by the business plan, provided that it is done so in a way that fully respects the underlying principles of the university. Instances in which advertising is offensive, in which it is crass or overwhelming, are incompatible with these values. But commercialism per se is not. It depends entirely on how the commercial activity is conducted.

The NCAA acts on behalf of its member institutions in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, and that includes carrying out commercial activity. For example, on behalf of its members, the NCAA negotiates and manages broadcast media contracts for its postseason championships. The NCAA has an obligation, derived from its members, to maximize the revenue from these contracts and to manage them following the best business practices.

In the past, and indeed currently, there is some ambivalence about business issues. To some extent, it is felt that it is improper, not quite right, for the NCAA to be engaged in business activity. Amateur sports should be above all that.

Athletics departments need the revenue, but working too hard to generate revenue somehow taints the purity of college sports.

Nonsense! This type of thinking is both a misinterpretation and a misapplication of amateurism. "Amateur" defines the participants, not the enterprise.

It is the obligation of the NCAA to maximize revenues for its members, provided of course that that business activity is informed by the values of higher education. Athletics directors and conference commissioners are fully aware of this NCAA obligation, and work to support it. For they know that it takes revenue to run a successful athletics program. We should not be ambivalent about doing the business of college sports. We should do it well, but always in conformity with the principles of higher education.

The national office is undertaking strategic steps to assure that the business activities are conducted according to these best practices. To do so, it will require the national office to organize itself somewhat differently. For example, the timeliness needed to be successful in a business environment sometimes exceeds the NCAA's ability to act through its standard processes. We will need to create more flexibility in operational decisions to be successful in this arena. Of course, and again, the controlling factor in all that is undertaken to enhance revenue is that decisions and actions are informed by those values most important to higher education.

The men's National Invitational Tournament—the NIT—is a recent example of this strategic approach. As a means toward the legal settlement and with the objective of developing a revenue-producing center, the NCAA purchased the tournaments. With the approval of the Executive Committee, a Limited Liability Corporation (LLC) was created to operate the NITs. The NCAA, through the Executive Committee, has oversight and the LLC financial accountability will be included within the NCAA's normal budgetary process. But this structure provides the flexibility required to meet the property's cost and over time to return net revenues.

It is difficult to predict other steps that will be necessary to enhance revenue generation. But all such steps will always be value-based and under the oversight of the appropriate NCAA governing body. Let us end the ambivalence and do the best job we can developing revenue for our athletics departments.

Equal attention, at a minimum, must be given to the expenditure side. If expenditures increase more rapidly than revenues in athletics, then no matter how hard we work on the revenue side, serious problems cannot be avoided. The underlying problem is that in Division I over the past several years, on average, the rate of expenditures in athletics has been increasing two to three times the rate of expenditures of the general university.

That is not a long-term sustainable approach. These problems mean that the universities will have to increase its subsidy to athletics. Some subsidy, in almost all cases, is required, and that is acceptable. But the greater the subsidy, the less funding is available for core academic activities of the university. Continued growth of athletics

department budgets is fully appropriate, but the rate of growth needs to be moderated in many cases. Issues surrounding athletics expenditures in Division I are the subject of a subcommittee of the Presidential Task Force for the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics.

The key take-away point is that we need to follow the best financial practices on both the revenue and expenditure sides. The immediate goal is to identify those best practices and articulate them in a way that will assist our members in managing the enterprise.

Ours is an awesome and grand trust—yours and mine, and everyone engaged in intercollegiate athletics. We are trusted with the future of college sports. One hundred years ago, President Roosevelt set us on our course. These 100 years are a prelude for the future. We must build on our past successes and eschew repeating our failures.

The future will no doubt hold new challenges. For the most part, we cannot predict what those challenges will be. While we can already sense that new media will cause us to look differently on how we present our games to fans, and that the next generations of students will have different perspectives and attitudes from today's student-athletes, that only scratches the surface.

The future is unknown because it is not fixed. To a significant extent, the future is open, and we have the ability to influence and shape it. What will happen is, in part, up to us. What we do now and how we react to changing events and conditions determines what the future will be for intercollegiate athletics. The trust we have entails an obligation to create the best future.

Of this, I am certain: We must be guided by the three principles fundamental to collegiate athletics. The student-athlete is to be at the center of all that we do. The participants of intercollegiate athletics are students enrolled in our universities and colleges. The contests in which they compete are to be safe and undertaken with integrity. And intercollegiate athletics is to be embedded into the mission of higher education on each of our campuses, and within the NCAA. The values of higher education are to be the values of intercollegiate athletics.

Ours is indeed an awesome and grand trust. We accept it knowingly and with pride. This trust carries the obligation to act on the basis of our values, the values of higher education. This trust binds us all together, and together we will protect, build and celebrate intercollegiate athletics.

This trust, too, must lead us to recognize that at the very core of intercollegiate athletics is the student-athlete. Let us celebrate all the participants, the literally millions and millions of young men and women who played, now play and will play in our athletics contests and who attend our institutions of higher learning. Cheers to all of them, past, present and future.

Let us all celebrate our student-athletes. I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Harrison: Thank you, Myles, for a very stern, provocative and thoughtful address, and for laying out the challenges that you present to us about the future. For those of you who would like a copy of the address, it is available online at www.ncaa.org. It will be reprinted in the January 16 issue of The NCAA News.

Take a breath, Myles, and get a sip of water, because I am about to ask you to return to the podium to present the third annual NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award. Ladies and gentlemen, Myles Brand again.

NCAA PRESIDENT'S GERALD R. FORD AWARDS

President Brand: Thank you again, Walt. This is one part of the Convention that I really like the most. It is my great pleasure to present the annual NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award. This is the third year that the NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award has been presented. It was created to honor an individual who has provided significant leadership as an active participant in collegiate athletics on a continuous basis over the course of his or her career.

Today's honorees fit the requirement perfectly. The NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award is named for President Gerald R. Ford, who served America as the 38th President during one of the most tumultuous periods of the nation's political history. He also was a student-athlete at the University of Michigan, where he participated on the national championship football teams in 1932 and 1933.

It was there at one of America's great universities that he acquired the qualities he would exhibit throughout

a career of public service. Those qualities, integrity, discipline to purpose and sacrifice for the greater good, served him well as his presidency began in controversy and required great strength of character. He is an example of how participation in intercollegiate athletics can shape leaders in critical times.

The 2006 recipients of the NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award are the epitome of dedication to the principles of the collegiate model I spoke about a few minutes ago, and the legacy of leadership that Gerald R. Ford represents.

John Wooden and Birch Bayh have made contributions to intercollegiate athletics that will continue to stand when the Association's second century is being celebrated. Coach Wooden is the model of what we mean when we use the term "teacher-coach." His education-based approach to coaching men's basketball is a model for many coaches today and one that all should emulate. His pyramid of success based on the ideals that faith and patience lead to success helped shape the lives of those who played for him and became a standard for leadership and management that extends well beyond the basketball court.

Coach, intercollegiate athletics has been made better because you have been among us. Your belief in the collegiate model continues to be an inspiration.

Audiovisual: Has it really been 30 years since John Wooden stopped coaching? As the "Wizard of Westwood," he has architected the most dominating dynasty in the history of college sports. Maybe it just seems like yesterday, because although he no longer coaches, his thoughts, his style, his very demeanor continues to inspire us all. The numbers alone make him a legend—10 NCAA championships, seven consecutively; four undefeated seasons; 88 consecutive victories; a three-time all-American as a player; seven times college basketball coach of the year; 81.3 percent lifetime winning percentage; college basketball player of the year; Sports Illustrated man of the year; coach of the century; a member of the Basketball Hall of Fame, both as a player and a coach; the Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient.

John Wooden was a high school champion in Martinsville, Indiana, just 30 minutes down the road from where we sit today, and then a college champion at Purdue, just 75 miles to the north. He was a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and then came the 27 years at UCLA.

Author of 17 books, he became the creator of the most famous pyramid since the Great Pyramid. Take away all that—the records, the honors and achievements—and you are left with a man with whom we would still celebrate. We are celebrating because of his love for family, his late wife of 53 years, Nell, his children, Jim and Nancy, his seven grandchildren and 13 great-grandchildren.

We would celebrate him for his faith, which he lives every day, and we would celebrate him for his impact as a teacher—a teacher who taught his players so much more than that, everything from how to put on their socks to how to live their lives.

Here is a story that pretty much tells you all you need to know about John Wooden. Wooden wanted his players to be clean-cut. His all-American center, Bill Walton, told coach Wooden that he was not going to get his hair cut. He told the coach he didn't have the right to make him. Coach Wooden said: "No, I don't, Bill. I just have the right to determine who is going to play. Bill, we are going to miss you." Walton got his hair cut.

And long before John Wooden was the "Wizard of Westwood," he was the head coach of Indiana State at Terre Haute. His 1946 team was invited to play in the NAIA tournament. There was one African-American player on his team, a kid who rode the bench and he was proud of the 11th of his 12 men. But because he was African-American and not allowed to participate in the tournament, the 36-year-old head coach refused the invitation.

John Wooden has been teaching us all for so many years. Coach, the lessons have been well learned. Thank you.

President Brand: Please help me welcome the 2006 recipient of the NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award to the microphone, coach John Wooden.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE—JOHN WOODEN

Mr. Wooden: Thank you very much. Dr. Brand, ladies and gentlemen, I really appreciate that fine reception,

and I am deeply honored at receiving this particular award. I know quite well the reasons behind it, and it would be most immodest if I attempted to feel that I was worthy of it, but I am very appreciative of those who made it possible.

Many young men whom I have had the privilege of working with over a great portion of my 95 years of life have gone in to different occupations. I think one of my young men who played for me is here and is now a director of athletics, Gary Cunningham. He is just one of the many who have gone on in different professions.

So, I feel so fortunate. I feel I have been blessed in so many ways. I like to think that when I was a teacher, I was more concerned with the events in the lives of my youngsters and how they eventually went on in life, rather than just in their basketball life.

I remember when I started the teaching profession, I ran across a couple of things that I think helped me to become a better teacher than I might have been otherwise.

One said: "No written word, no spoken plea, Can teach our youth what they should be, Nor all the books on all the shelves. It's what the teachers are themselves."

I believe the best teachers are those who are the ones who set the example; and, of course, the most important teacher is parenting—the most important profession in the world.

Also, I recall reading something else. When I think of the many young men who have gone into different professions, I think of this. When a lady was asked why she taught, she said:

They ask me why I teach
And I reply, "Where could I find more splendid company?"
There sits a statesman,
Strong, unbiased, wise,
Another later Webster,
Silver-tongued,
And there a doctor
Whose quick, steady hand
Can mend a bone or stem the lifeblood's flow.
A builder sits beside him
Upward rise the arches of that church he builds wherein
That minister will speak the word of God,
And lead a stumbling soul to touch the Christ.

And, all about
A lesser gathering
Of farmers, merchants, teachers,
Laborers, men
Who work and vote and build
And plan and pray into a great tomorrow.
And, I say,
"I may not see the church,
Or hear the word,
Or eat the food their hands will grow."
And yet—I may.
And later I may say,
"I knew the lad, and he was strong,
Or weak, or kind, or proud
Or bold, or gay.
I knew him once,
But then he was a boy."

They ask me why I teach, and I reply,
“Where could I find more splendid company?”

I have been so blessed through many years of scholastic and intercollegiate teaching—both in the classroom and in the athletic field. Such magnificent memories, that is one of the things of which I am truly blessed. I thank you very much for your reception for me here, and I thank all of you who are in this wonderful profession working with others, where there is no greater occupation than working in our intercollegiate athletic system. We must never forget they are there first to get an education.

Athletics is second in nature. They may be providing the education for many, but it is the education that is going to be most meaningful for them the rest of their lives. Thank you very much.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

President Brand: Title IX—that watershed legislation offered by Senator Bayh—as I mentioned before, is one of the most important pieces of civil rights legislation affecting higher education in the last half of the 20th century.

Tens of thousands of young women since 1972 and hundreds of thousands of them in the future have the opportunity to enhance their collegiate experience and to prepare for life through athletic participation in the same way that young men have been able to do and benefit from for generations.

Birch Bayh, your determination to bring this legislation forward and to be such a steadfast protector of Title IX has meant all the difference in the world to past, present and future generations. What greater contribution can a public figure make?

Audiovisual: With Birch Bayh having been elected in 1963 to Washington, D.C., as Indiana’s newly elected senator, the United States was about to enter a period of change. A President would be assassinated, a war would be battled, and then change generations, and another President would be forced to resign. Civil rights, voting rights and women’s rights would be addressed in the halls of Congress and then on the streets of America.

Through all of this, Birch Bayh was no mere spectator. His legislative initiatives had and continue to have a profound influence on millions of Americans. It has been said that Bayh drafted more of the U.S. Constitution than any member of the House and Senate since James Madison.

Following the Kennedy assassination, Bayh was the principal author of the 25th Amendment that established the rules for presidential succession. He then offered the 26th Amendment, which gave 18-year-olds the right to vote, and in 1972, the Senator from Indiana championed the Equal Rights Amendment that said equality of rights shall not be denied or abridged because of sex. It failed six states short of being ratified.

[Note: The following audiovisual was played.]

Mr. Bayh: Since I was the sponsor, I found and learned about evidence of discrimination. The one thing about me is that I was taught at an early age that education is more important than anything else in life. My father and mother both had been teachers. There was a way in which women were treated as second-class citizens in our nation’s school systems. At the time they were receiving half the number of academic scholarships. The scholarship is now about half or less than what the men students would get. That is a crime. We can’t let 52 percent of the brain power in this country go undeveloped. So, that really was my No. 1 goal—to do something about the quality of education; to get the Rights Amendment passed that provided equality across the board.

We started on Title IX which, of course, in one of the simple sentences say there shall be no discrimination against anyone on the basis of sex at any of our institutions of higher learning.

Audiovisual: Although it is the application of Title IX, it has gained great public visibility; the law applies to every single aspect of education. In 1972, when Title IX was authored, 40 percent of the overall collegiate student body was female. Today, that number is over 56 percent. The numbers of female athletes in 1972 were one out of every 27 high school graduates who competed in sports. Today the number is one in 2.5. That is a direct tribute to Title IX.

Senator Bayh knew the package went to others. With Senator Dole, he authored the Bayh-Dole Act, which revitalized the patent system, and he co-authored the Criminal Justice Act that mandated the placing of juvenile offenders from adult prisoners.

For Senator Birch Bayh, the road from Summitville, Indiana, to Washington, D.C., was indeed a long one, but for our nation the rewards at the end of that road have indeed been great.

President Brand: Our co-recipient of the 2006 Gerald R. Ford Award—Senator Birch Bayh.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE—BIRCH BAYH

Mr. Bayh: Thank you. President Brand, thank you for that magnificent eulogy. (Laughter) To you and chairman Harrison and the co-honoree whom I have long admired, coach John Wooden, and to the division leaders, to receive such recognition fills me with a combination of emotion and humility.

As I said last year when I had the privilege of saying a few words to the Final Four participants in the girl's tournament that was here in Indianapolis, I am a very emotional guy. Let me share just a few quick personal thoughts.

First, I want to say that I personally and I think our country owes a debt of gratitude to Myles Brand and the leaders and all of you who are part of the NCAA family for standing up and being counted when there were those who tried to stop the progress of Title IX. You can be proud of the fact that you were the first to stand up and say, "No way, not on my watch." That set such a blazing example that could not be ignored.

As one who had a small part to play in the implementation of this legislation, thank you, and thank you on behalf of present and future generations, students and athletes.

To share this Gerald Ford Award ... I should say that Gerald Ford was a good friend of mine. We served together in Congress; we competed against one another every spring when the Democrats and Republicans had that Congressional baseball game. The quality of the fun was better than the quality of play, at least for those other folks, of course (Laughter).

I got to know Gerry and it was my privilege to be the lead witness when the House commenced its hearings as to whether Gerald Ford was qualified to be Vice President after he had been nominated by President Nixon upon the resignation of Vice President Agnew.

I said to them and I said it qualifiedly, I thought that Gerry Ford was exactly the kind of person we had in mind when we passed the 25th Amendment. Without Gerry Ford being there as a rock of strength, a breath of fresh air when President Nixon resigned, I hate to think what would have happened to our country.

It was a holy day when Gerry Ford took the reins, and I am grateful to him to this day for that. To be receiving this award as a co-recipient means more to me than I can say. I should say to share this honor with the man who I have long idolized means even more.

Some of you have heard me say that the gentleman who had the greatest impact on my life was my father. He coached athletics and athletic teams at Indiana State. He spent 53 years of his life in the pursuit of excellence in sports and physical education, athletics, and scholarships.

Some people asked how were you interested in something like this? After it all happened, I recall an experience that my younger sister, Mary Alice, and I had. I must have been 10 and maybe she was eight or nine, and we were sitting around the breakfast table and dad said: "I am going to go up and testify before Congress."

I said: "What are you going to say, dad?" He said: "Well, I am going to tell them that they need to appropriate money so little girls can have physical education and if they ask why, I am going to say little girls need strong bodies to carry their minds around in just like little boys."

All I can say is I have good genes for Title IX. Dad was the one who first mentioned Coach Wooden to me. Coach, as you know, had played basketball in Martinsville down in Morgan County. Dad was a basketball referee of some note at that time. He refereed 10 final games in the high school tournament and ended up in the Basketball Hall of Fame because of his prowess.

He mentioned this young Wooden athlete, proud of him as he went to Purdue. I am proud we share an alma mater and of being Boilermakers. Then he told me the example he had set for us all to see. It was an example that my dad set for me. I shared his enthusiasm.

I didn't admire all that much of his talent, because my dream was to become a professional baseball player.

Instead of throwing from shortstop or the pitcher's mound, I ended up throwing hay bales in the mound on the farm. But he taught me it was important to follow the rules of the game.

I remember him saying: "Birch, if it is close enough to call, it is close enough to swing at." I have always followed that rule particularly when he was there. (Laughter) In those days, you didn't boo the referee and you didn't contest calls. I think that meant so much to me.

Some of you have heard me tell the story about the second most important person, and perhaps the most important as far as Title IX is concerned. I was representing Indiana at a speech contest in Chicago and sitting down next to me was a young woman who had a strange drawl.

I asked her where she was from. She said Oklahoma. I said: "Oklahoma, sit down and get to know some people from Indiana." A couple of hours later, we were having lunch and nine months later we were married. She was a fast woman. (Laughter) I am sorry about that, honey.

There was something about her that is impossible to capture in words. She was a straight-A student at Garfield County High School, the first girl president of the student body, elected governor of Girl's State and president of Girl's Nation and got to meet President Truman in the Rose Garden between her junior and senior year of high school. She was a piece of work. Her dream was to go to the University of Virginia. Her application was returned, "Women need not apply." So we spent 26 1/2 wonderful years together with Marvella, teaching Birch what it was really like to be a woman in a man's world. Without Marvella Bayh, I am sure I wouldn't understand the importance of legislation like Title IX.

I was blessed to find another woman who would have something to do with me, and we have had 24 wonderful years together. I am not here to give you my matrimonial history. This is as far as it goes. (Laughter) Tell Marvella that, will you, Peg? I will tell Kitty that, I should say.

These women have had a big impact on me. You don't do all these wonderful things you have given me credit for without a whole lot of folks helping you. My present wife has given me a feeling for what it is like to be a woman in a man's world of business, and we have raised a wonderful boy, who has suddenly turned 23 and graduated from Indiana University. I have to explain an experience that happened in his young life.

He was in kindergarten. His mother was driving him to school and he was perched in a car seat in the back, and Marvella—Kitty, excuse me. I get these wonderful women confused, Kitty. I guess it is good that one of them is not here right now. (Laughter) I have to tell you she was the one who told me, when I didn't have any idea what I was going to say at the ceremony they had at the federal building or the courthouse, she said: "Birch, you just get up there and start off by telling those people you wouldn't be anything at all today if it had not been for Marvella." Anyway, she was driving along and she made some sort of comment, and five-year-old Chris in the back said: "Not bad for a girl, mom." Whereupon, that Honda took a quick right across two lanes of traffic to the shoulder. It came to a stop, and she said: "What's that?" "Not bad for a girl, mom." "Where did you hear that?" He said: "Mrs. Bitters told us there are some things that girls can't do." Mrs. Bitters was the kindergarten teacher. Fortunately, this was late in the spring. (Laughter) We found out that Mrs. Bitters was going to be teaching the first grade. We took Chris out and put him in another school. So, I have been blessed to have two wonderful women who have helped me.

I want to say once again how grateful I am for the assistance of the NCAA. Myles, you have such a great support staff. If I were to give credit to all here who helped in this battle and continue to help, I would leave some out. But I think I should identify at least two because of the ongoing role that they played in trying to keep moving toward the implementation of Title IX. Both of them will be embarrassed for my doing so, but I think I should point out the tremendous role that your senior vice president in charge of championships, Judith Sweet, has made and continues to make. (Applause) I also should point out the role that the distinguished athletics director of the University of Nevada, Cary Groth, continues to play. She and Ted Leland, the athletics director at Stanford, are members of the Paige Commission that met for a year and reached the conclusion that Title IX was injurious, but because of them, the commission finally decided that was not the way to go.

But more recently, since this opposition reared its ugly head again, both of them had the courage to write personal letters to each athletics director in two or three levels of the administration of every university. I think there must have been about 4,000 letters that went out to these folks saying as members who sat on that commission,

we voted not to use the very language that was given when the Secretary of Education is using now as a clarification as to how to enforce Title IX, that this really provides a back door and lets those universities that don't want to qualify have an escape valve. So, we owe them a debt of gratitude.

I owe a debt of gratitude to all of you. I just want to say don't give up the faith and don't stop working away here. I believe it was Jefferson who said that liberty and justice require eternal vigilance. So does Title IX. It is easy for some of you here and some of your friends who are not here to say: "Well, what I do doesn't make a difference."

Don't you believe it. The one who had the privilege of authoring Title IX was elected to the United States Senate in 1962 by two votes per precinct. If one of the voters who voted for me had instead voted for my opponent, there may not have been a Title IX. So give credit where credit is due, to each of you as individuals, who have continued letting those people know that they can't stand still, that we need to move forward until we have a full recognition of equality for women on our athletics teams as well as in our classrooms. Thank you for your patience.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Harrison: Thank you all for joining us for what I am sure you agree with me were some memorable moments and a great testament to all of those people who have contributed to intercollegiate athletics—past, present and future.

Please don't forget we have an Honors Dinner this evening just after this ceremony is completed. The doors for the Honors Celebration, which is also here, will open at 6:45, and that celebration will begin promptly at 7:30. I am told that you will need to be scanned or have your ticket to enter the theatre. I am not sure I know what being scanned means exactly, but it sounds like fun. (Laughter)

Also, please refer to the Convention schedule for your business sessions and forums. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you again for attending. Please join me in one final round of applause for our co-recipients. (Applause)

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.]

HONORS DINNER

Saturday, January 7, 2006

The 2006 NCAA Honors Dinner was called to order at 7:30 p.m., by Walter Harrison, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of the University of Hartford.

WELCOME

Prerecording: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of the University of Hartford, Walter Harrison.

Mr. Harrison: Thank you. Good evening and welcome to the 41st annual NCAA Honors Celebration. Tonight, we are here to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the NCAA and 18 individuals who exemplify the Association's ideals of learning, balance, spirit, community, fair play and character. Each of tonight's honorees has already become an important figure in the collective history of the NCAA. Their passion for sport is matched only by their individual desire to help wherever they see a need. It is our distinct privilege to have them here tonight.

The NCAA Centennial Celebration will be a year-long salute to the student-athlete, and we are excited to be kicking it off here during our annual Convention. Over the next 12 months, NCAA member institutions, conferences and communities will participate in special events that commemorate 100 years of the student-athlete. I hope you will join me in applauding a gentleman who is not only devoted to upholding the principles of the NCAA, but who has also put the student-athlete at the very center of the NCAA's mission. Please welcome NCAA president, Dr. Myles Brand.

I would also like to introduce a few other people, without whom this evening would not be possible—the NCAA Honors Committee. Please stand for a well-deserved round of applause. From Columbia University, the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, Valerie Richardson; from the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference, Thomas Brown; NCAA president emeritus, let's welcome back Cedric Dempsey; from the Ohio Athletic Conference, Timothy Gleason; from Ohio State University, Susan Hartmann; from Yale University, former Dallas Cowboy star, Calvin Hill; from Western Carolina University, Gibbs Knotts; from the America East Conference, my own conference, Julie Ruppert; and although she couldn't be with us this evening, from UCLA, Olympic gold medalist, Jackie Joyner-Kersey.

On behalf of everyone here, please accept our deepest appreciation for your making this evening possible. (Applause)

Earlier today, the NCAA had the honor of awarding a co-presentation of the NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award to native Hoosiers, Senator Birch Bayh and John Wooden, whose contributions to intercollegiate athletics and the goal of equality had been so significant.

Senator Bayh's creation of Title IX and coach Wooden's unprecedented record based on firm principles of scholarship and citizenship have positively and permanently impacted the college sports world. We would like to say congratulations to Senator Bayh and coach Wooden. Please join me in a round of applause. (Applause)

This year, you may notice the awards we will be presenting have a new look. The shape and color of each award was thoughtfully chosen to represent the honor for which it is given. The tall composition of each award points boldly toward the sky, representing the student-athlete's life-long journey toward excellence in all things, and the five flutes represent the NCAA's five founding principles, with the Association's logo placed proudly front and center. To present our new awards, we thought it would be wonderful to celebrate our past by bringing back some former NCAA honors recipients to give us a hand. We are thrilled this evening to welcome Top VIII recipient Kara Lawson, Silver Anniversary honoree Calvin Hill and Theodore Roosevelt Award winner Coach John Wooden. Although she is not here, I would like to give a special thanks to actress and die-hard Kentucky Wildcats fan, Ashley Judd, for lending her voice to tonight's program by narrating all of the profiles featuring our honorees.

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Finally, we are honored tonight to have back as our host, a man whose competitive spirit has carried him through life. As a sophomore, he won a spot on Yale football's first string. Later, he won enough money on "Jeopardy" to finance law school. Then he won enough cases to become a media legal expert, and eventually a full-time TV personality. Since then, he has earned many more distinctions, including two Emmys, a Peabody and the title of People magazine's sexiest news anchor. He was also the recipient of an NCAA Silver Anniversary award in 1997. We are so glad he is back. Ladies and gentlemen, Jack Ford. (Applause)

Jack Ford: And now ladies and gentlemen, let the 2006 NCAA Honors Celebration begin.

Prerecording: Tonight from the historic Murat Theatre in downtown Indianapolis, we present the 41st annual NCAA Honors Celebration, featuring from Bellarmine University, NCAA Inspiration Award honoree, Lois Taurman, and the 2006 recipients of the NCAA Top VIII Award: from the University of Georgia, Olympic gold medalist, Samantha Arsenault; from Truman State University, Sarah Dance; from Amherst College, Carter Hamill; from Brown University, Nick Hartigan; from the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, DeMeco Ryans; from the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Richelle Simpson; from the University of Portland, Christine Sinclair; from California State University, Fresno, Jamie Southern; and from Amherst College, NCAA Inspiration Award honoree, Raul Altreche.

Now, this year's NCAA Silver Anniversary Award winners: from the University of Virginia, president of USA Basketball, Val Ackerman; from Brigham Young University, executive director of basketball operations for the Boston Celtics, Danny Ainge; from Vanderbilt University, Charles Davis; from Pepperdine University, Dr. Terry Schroeder; from Baylor University, San Francisco 49ers assistant head coach, Mike Singletary; from Yale University, Susan Wellington; plus, our third NCAA Inspiration Award honoree, from Princeton University, civil rights leader, John Doar; and the recipient of the 2006 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award, from Columbia University, owner and CEO of the world champion New England Patriots, Robert Kraft.

Mr. Ford: Good evening. I am Jack Ford, and welcome to the 2006 NCAA Top VIII Awards, the Silver Anniversary Awards, the Inspiration Awards, and the NCAA highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award, to 18 distinguished current and former student-athletes.

Back in 1906, when college officials nationwide were debating whether athletics had any place on campus, one man believed that sports, if thoughtfully regulated, could be the perfect complement to higher education. He was a Harvard alumnus, a former student-athlete and a football fan, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt. Under President Roosevelt's guidance, an association was formed with 39 schools overseeing a few sports, like football, baseball and track and field. Now, a century later, the NCAA has grown to administer 88 championships in 23 sports among 1,250 member institutions. Every year, more than 360,000 student-athletes participate in official NCAA competition, all the while getting a superior education that sustains the momentum of success that they have achieved in the sport.

As you will see tonight, the NCAA provides a foundation for the student-athlete on which great accomplishments can indeed be built.

Many of the men and women here this evening have already enjoyed recognition from their athletic achievements, from Olympic medals to world championship rings. Those trophies represent tenacity and leadership in the athletic arena, but tonight's honorees have also displayed tenacity and leadership in all parts of their lives.

The women who remember life before Title IX when inequality was the norm, who have gone on to become corporate executives and champions for women's athletics, or the man who fought on the basketball court, but faced many tougher battles in the civil rights movement, the eight young men and women who have proved themselves to be outstanding in a field of student-athletes who are all remarkable.

They are the NCAA and the awards we will be presenting them are newly designed to represent the founding principles that have served this Association so very well for the past century.

Coach Wooden once said: "Sports do not build character, they reveal it." Tonight you will meet 18 current and former student-athletes of incredible character, starting with our first award.

INSPIRATION AWARD

NCAA Inspiration Award winners have included heroes who have performed the ultimate feat of saving lives, and survivors who never knew the depth of their courage until it was tested. This is a special award that is not automatically presented every year, and this year we are fortunate to have not just one, but three honorees, and inspiration is the perfect word to describe our first honoree.

Audiovisual: When faced with adversity many crumble under its magnitude, but not Lois Taurman.

As a youth, she was as comfortable running baseline as she was in the batting cage. At Bellarmine University in Kentucky, Taurman became the only NCAA student-athlete in the school's history to compete in three sports for four straight years.

Taurman excelled in them all. She was Bellarmine's all-time leading scorer in women's basketball and led her softball team to a state championship her senior season. Named athlete of the year in 1983, Taurman's life was full of promise until one fateful day in October 1984 when tragedy struck. She was paralyzed in an accidental fall from a roof.

Despite being confined to a wheelchair, Taurman was determined to pursue her dreams. She did just that. Taurman completed her nursing degree while still in a rehabilitation center. Then, with the resolve and self-discipline of an elite student-athlete, Taurman once again set her sights on sports, this time in a new arena.

Competing as a quadriplegic, Taurman gained national and international acclaim in track and field. At the 1987 Stoke Mandeville Games in England, she won four gold and three silver medals and represented the United States the following year in the Paralympics Games in Seoul, Korea, in some ways eclipsing her athletic achievements in college.

Taurman was as impressive in her postgrad studies, obtaining a master's degree in education from the University of Louisville, and a law degree with honors from Brandeis School of Law. Today, she is a highly sought-after motivational speaker, sharing her courageous journey with the world.

Lois Taurman, a woman of unyielding dedication, ambition and an indomitable spirit. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Tonight, Lois will be receiving the NCAA Inspiration Award specially designed to symbolize a beacon of hope, which she most certainly is. Ladies and gentlemen, from Bellarmine University, Lois Taurman. [The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Lois will receive her Inspiration Award from Jim Spalding, retired athletics director, Bellarmine University. (Applause)

RESPONSE—LOIS TAURMAN

Ms. Taurman: First, I would like to congratulate the other Inspiration Award recipients. Second, I would like to thank the selection committee, the Great Lakes Valley Conference and the Bellarmine College family. Oops. When I went to Bellarmine, we were a college. We since have become a university. Thanks to my fellow university family.

I would like to acknowledge my mom and my sister, Karen, and a close family friend, Ms. Helen Petrie.

When it came time to go to college, I knew I wanted to go to Bellarmine. It became a no-brainer when I was offered a scholastic volleyball scholarship. Once I got to Bellarmine, I knew I wanted to play basketball and softball as well. So, I went to my athletics director and coach Hope, and said I wanted to play basketball. He rolled his eyes, and finally relented and allowed me to try out for the basketball team. Once I made the basketball team, I came back to the coach and I told him I really needed to play softball. He rolled his eyes, finally relented, and allowed me to try out for the softball team.

Looking back, I now know why the coach rolled his eyes. He thought I was crazy. He is right. I was crazy. During my entire career at Bellarmine, I was always playing one sport. Most of the time I was playing two sports at a time along with majoring in biology. However, this is a craziness I would never change for anything. My passion and love for sports was too strong to do otherwise. My passion for sports saved my life as well.

My mom was told but for the fact I was in such tremendous shape I would have never survived the accident.

It was only logical I would seek sports after I got hurt. I met some great people who introduced me to wheelchair racing and wheelchair fencing.

I remember when I first started training for wheelchair racing; I decided I would push around my neighborhood block. It is a block that is exactly a half mile. It is a block I had ran countless times before with such ease.

My mom and family friend, Jeannie, decided they would accompany me. I believe I cried the entire time, because the pain was so unbearable. It took me over an hour to complete the block. I am happy to report that I truly got that time down to three minutes and 25 seconds, and that mom and Jeannie have to get on a bike to keep up with me. (Applause)

Racing and wheelchair fencing has provided me the opportunity to travel and compete internationally and to continue my education. Throughout the years, I would occasionally be called inspirational, and I never quite understood that because all I was doing was playing the hand that was dealt to me, taking each day as it came, and trying to be successful in each and every day.

The more I was called inspirational, the more I got to think before one could be deemed inspirational one must be inspired, and that is true in my case. My inspiration is and will always be my mom. Imagine the following scenario: You are a young pregnant woman; you have six children under the age of six. My mom had two sets of twins.

Your husband walks out on you leaving you with these six young children to raise on your own. You are then told you have cancer. Well, that is my mom's story. I didn't know much about her story growing up. All I knew I had a hard-working, loving mother who worked as many as four jobs at a time in order to keep me and my siblings together and provide us with the best of education.

My mom's presence has always been the light in my life. Sometimes that light was a strong beacon, other times it was a soft night light, but a light that, nevertheless, keeps darkness from my life. I share this award with her tonight, and everything I am and certainly everything I will be is because of her. Again, my sincere thanks for this great, great honor. Thank you. (Applause)

Audiovisual: Still ahead on the 2006 NCAA Honors Celebration, meet the Top VIII Award winners, the recipients of the Silver Anniversary Awards, and this year's Theodore Roosevelt Honoree, Robert Kraft.

TOP VIII AWARDS

Audiovisual: Just three years ago, Kara Lawson was probably wondering what the future held when she left the University of Tennessee and the Lady Volunteers basketball team. Today, she has two careers, one as a star on the 2005 WNBA world champion Sacramento Monarchs, and the other as a highly regarded basketball analyst for TV. Whether she is calling the shots or making them, Kara Lawson is always on her game.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome a young woman who was an NCAA Top VIII recipient just two years ago, the extremely talented, Ms. Kara Lawson. (Applause)

Ms. Lawson: Just two years ago, I was here to accept a Top VIII award, and tonight I feel just as honored to be here again presenting them. The NCAA Top VIII Award recognizes eight student-athletes who have recently completed their athletics eligibility, and if the success of past recipients is any indication, tonight's honorees are in for some exciting times. They are about to join the ranks of Lynette Woodard, Rebecca Lobo, Peggy Boutilier, John Naber and the brothers Manning—otherwise known as Peyton and Eli.

This evening's first four recipients are distinctly individual. Some spend four hours a day practicing their sport before they head off to volunteer, and others spend four hours a day in the lab before they even get to practice. What makes them similar is their dedication to becoming the best NCAA student-athletes and citizens they can be.

Audiovisual: Samantha Arsenault has accomplished more by the age of 24 than many achieve in a lifetime. She began her collegiate swimming career at the University of Georgia with two international titles under her belt, a gold medal in the 200-meter freestyle at the World Cup in Paris, and a stellar performance in the women's 800-meter freestyle relay at the 2000 Sydney Olympics.

In 2005, with the Lady Bulldogs, this seven-time all-American led her team to the NCAA Division I

Championship, and earned individual titles in the 200- and 400-medley relays, as well as being named an NCAA Woman of the Year state winner.

Arsenault's hard work in the water was matched by her efforts in school, earning her the Kappa Delta Epsilon Honor Society's perfect 4.0 award. Despite her rigorous schedule, Arsenault made time to be a mentor, volunteering to read at elementary schools and speaking to children about the dangers of drugs.

Arsenault graduated in 2000 with a degree in science education, a GPA of 3.8 and an NCAA postgraduate scholarship. Tireless in the pool, the classroom and the community, Samantha Arsenault demonstrates how to achieve world-class excellence in true NCAA fashion.

Truman State graduate Sarah Dance can attest to the power of teamwork.

During her collegiate swimming career, she led her team to four consecutive NCAA Division II national championship titles. A member of seven national championship freestyle relay teams, she holds national records in both the 400- and 800-yard relays.

Dance has accumulated many individual achievements as well, becoming all-American an astonishing 28 times. Valued by her coaches for her versatility in the pool, Dance displayed the same qualities in the classroom, earning a perfect 4.0 grade-point average in exercise science, with a minor in biology, and amassing a collection of academic honors, including the NCAA Walter Byers postgraduate scholarship.

While she wasn't swimming or studying, Dance volunteered in her local hospital's emergency room, where she learned many skills she can use with her newest team, the University of Nebraska's Medical School class of 2009.

A student of psychology, Carter Hamill knows that the very best runners possess both physical and mental toughness. Indeed, this Amherst College track and cross country cocaptain has harnessed both, winning a staggering five NCAA Division III national championship titles in the women's indoor 5,000- and the outdoor 10,000-meter races, and being named an all-American 18 times.

At the 2005 NCAA Division III Outdoor Track and Field Championships, Hamill finished over a full minute ahead of the pack in the 10,000-meter race, shaving two minutes off her winning time in the same event in the year before and becoming the most accomplished runner in Jeffs' history.

Hamill's ability and attitude earned her the Gordon B. Perry Memorial Award for Scholarship and Citizenship and the Howard Hill Mossman Trophy for the graduating Amherst student-athlete who brought the greatest athletic honor to her alma mater.

She also brought honor to Amherst in other ways, like volunteering at the medical college of Virginia's Massey Cancer Center. With her gift for running and admirable character, Carter Hamill is always prepared to go the distance and beyond.

Nick Hartigan is a natural leader. This Brown University football star led his team to the 2005 Ivy League championship, while leading the nation in rushing and scoring. He was unanimously chosen the Ivy League player of the year and is the first player in Brown history to win the Agganis/Zimman Award for the outstanding Division I player in New England. Hartigan also landed in the final three for the Walter Payton Award.

In true NCAA fashion, Hartigan's athletic abilities are perfectly complemented by his scholarship. He is the second Ivy League football player in 50 years to be named the academic all-American of the year. Hartigan was a finalist for a Rhodes scholarship and a Draddy Award, known as the "academic Heisman."

Last year, after a teammate was diagnosed with Ewings Sarcoma, Hartigan rallied the Bears by organizing a "bench-a-thon" to benefit the Lawrence Rubida fund for cancer research, demonstrating that no matter what the circumstance, Nick Hartigan can take the lead.

Ms. Lawson: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Georgia, Samantha Arsenault. (Applause) Samantha will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Dr. Michael Adams, president, University of Georgia. (Applause)

From Truman State University, Sarah Dance. Sarah will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Dr. Barbara Dixon, president, Truman State University. (Applause)

From Amherst College, Carter Hamill. Carter will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Erik Nedeau, head men and women's cross country and track and field coach, Amherst College. (Applause)

From Brown University, Nick Hartigan. Nick will receive his Top VIII Award tonight from Michael Goldberger, director of athletics, Brown University. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: We are here with the first four recipients of our Top VIII Awards to talk to them about some of the things that are important to them as student-athletes.

Samantha, I am going to start with you. You are an Olympic gold medalist, an all-American and are involved in so many other activities as a student-athlete. The question I think so many people ask is how can somebody who is as involved as you are, as busy as you are, still have time to give back to your community the way you do, and why is that so important to you?

Ms. Arsenault: I feel that giving back to the community is the least I can do for having been blessed with all the opportunities I have had. I love to share my stories. I hope I can inspire just one person along the way. I just really enjoy working with people. I think everybody has a really unique story to tell.

Mr. Ford: Sarah, we have seen what you have accomplished as an athlete and student-athlete and now as a medical student. How have your experiences as a student-athlete helped to prepare you for your career in medicine?

Ms. Dance: One of my favorite things about academic work is there is always room for improvement. It doesn't matter how fast I go, whether it is the best race in my life, there is always room for improvement. It doesn't matter what grade I have—whether it's at the top of the class—there is always something more to learn. It absolutely applies to medicine. I think it is probably one of my favorite things that in medicine there is always more technologies and more discoveries and more patients to help.

Mr. Ford: You and I were talking about the fact that as a former student-athlete now in medical school, strangely you find you have more time for your studies than you did when you were participating as a student-athlete as opposed to some of your classmates.

Ms. Dance: Absolutely. Most of the classmates didn't spend four to five hours a day training. So they feel they have less time to study. I have four to five more hours a day to do all the studying I want to.

Mr. Ford: Or lying on a couch reading a magazine. Carter, we mentioned in your introduction you had received the Howard Hill Mossman Trophy at Amherst. Obviously, it is a very important, prestigious award there. You had a lot to do with sports. What are your thoughts and messages that you would like to pass on to student-athletes as to the importance of sportsmanship?

Ms. Hamill: I have a great deal of respect and admiration for it. There is certainly underlying feeling, respect and admiration for the other athletes, because it is particularly great in an individual sport like running.

Mr. Ford: Nick, this question applies to all of you, but I want to ask you to answer it. In juggling your enormous athletic successes and your equally enormous academic successes, it raises the question that all student-athletes ask, even back in high school. How do you manage them both? How do you manage to be successful as an athlete and to be successful as a student without sacrificing one or the other?

Mr. Hartigan: I think it is a matter of bringing the same intensity to the scholastic issues that you do to the athletic side. My teams and I, as soon as practice is over, we attack academics with the same intensity as we attack every field and work out, and everything we do in life.

Mr. Ford: I wish you had not attacked this Yale team as you did this year.

A question for all of you. Samantha, I will start with you. In looking back, obviously, you are not that far removed from your academic and athletic experiences. Is there one sort of significant shining moment that you will each look upon when you look back to say this was so important to me in my development as a student-athlete?

Ms. Arsenault: The relationships that you build with the people you are surrounded by. Celebrating with the 18 girls when winning an NCAA title this past year is something we had worked together for years. Looking into the eyes of those girls will stay with me the rest of my life.

Mr. Ford: Sarah, how about you?

Ms. Dance: For me, it has to be our conference championship. The first three years our conference championships were held in the Missouri area. We were only about four hours apart. My senior year, we went to Delta State University in Mississippi, and it is 12 or 13 hours away, and one of the freshmen looked up into the stands

and asked me why so many Truman fans were there when most of the teams are closer and only a couple of hours away. Yet we are 12 to 13 hours away and some families live farther. All I could tell her was they just care that much. It has been that way at every conference meet and every national meet, whether it has been in North Dakota or New York. To me, it just symbolizes they were there more to see us succeed, whether or not that meant you won. They were there to celebrate with us in what we could do, and that meant more than what I could do as an individual, but what we could do as a team.

Mr. Ford: True support of athletics is being supported by their friends regardless of what happens.

Carter, how about you, a shining moment?

Ms. Hamill: This reminds me of your very first question about sportsmanship. During one of our indoor national races, at the conclusion of the meet during the photo option, all the teams came together and a bunch of the girls from our conference, who are usually competitors and people who you wouldn't normally get a picture with get together. We got together and had a moment that really meant something.

Mr. Ford: Nick, how about you?

Mr. Hartigan: First off, I have played football for 17 years, and we have a lot of fun with it.

Mr. Ford: You desire it as well. To all of you, our thanks to you for joining us. We know your family and friends and your institution are enormously proud of what you have accomplished. Congratulations and good luck to all of you. (Applause)

Ms. Lawson: There is no doubt that our first four Top VIII recipients were clearly outstanding in their fields and community. Although they have completed their athletics eligibility, each of them is such a part of everything the NCAA stands for, which is why this award comes in true NCAA blue. Our second four honorees are equally worthy, so let's take a look at just what makes these NCAA student-athletes so amazing.

Audiovisual: Whether tackling opponents or textbooks, University of Alabama linebacker DeMeco Ryans moves with the speed of sound.

Nominated for both the Butkus Award and the Lombardi Award, this 2005 SEC defensive player of the year and the National Football Coaches Association first team all-American anchored a Crimson Tide unit that ranked first nationally in scoring defense allowing just 10.7 points per game.

As a management major, Ryans earned a remarkable four academic all-SEC selections and graduated one semester early, while securing cum laude honors. And, when victims of Hurricane Katrina were forced to relocate to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, Ryans responded swiftly, organizing his teammates to help raise money and feed children at local shelters.

His distinguished resume on and off the field earned him the 2005 Lott Trophy, an honor based on athletic performance and personal character, qualities that are more than abundant in Alabama's DeMeco Ryans.

Determination is a word that applies to Richelle Simpson in the gym and in everything the University of Nebraska graduate does.

A nine-time NCAA all-America gymnast, Simpson captured the national all-around and floor exercise titles her junior year and in 2005 helped lead the Cornhuskers to a berth in the NCAA championships.

In the classroom, Simpson excelled. A member of the Nebraska Student-Athlete Advisory Committee who had a dual major in international studies and French, Simpson achieved a 3.8 grade-point average, which helped her earn both NCAA and Big 12 postgraduate scholarships.

Simpson even found time for volunteer work with Safe Quarters, an organization that raises awareness for domestic violence. Her extraordinary talents garnered her the AAI American Award given to the nation's top gymnast in recognition of achievements in athletics, academics and civic responsibility.

Named the 2005 Nebraska female student-athlete of the year and the Big 12 female sports person of the year, Richelle Simpson flourishes no matter what the challenge.

As a freshman striker, Christine Sinclair delighted University of Portland soccer coach Clive Charles with her boundless potential. With 23 goals, Sinclair was the leading freshman scorer in NCAA Division I women's soccer. In 2002, her golden goal sealed the national championship for the Pilots, the institution's first national title in any sport.

But the following year, tragedy struck the Portland soccer program, as coach Charles lost his fight with can-

cer. Sinclair never missed a step. In 2004, she scored 22 goals and received soccer's most prestigious award—the Hermann Trophy.

When she wasn't scoring goals, Sinclair was helping others reach theirs by volunteering at a local children's hospital and the Ronald McDonald House.

Twice named the most outstanding player in the Women's College Cup, this three-time unanimous all-America selection and two-time academic all-American set an all-time NCAA single-season record in 2005 with 39 goals, becoming the second-leading career scorer in the history of NCAA Division I women's soccer.

And as Sinclair led her team to an undefeated season and a second national championship, she knew that somewhere coach Charles was smiling.

The list of accomplishments Fresno State softball pitcher Jamie Southern has accumulated is long and impressive, making this four-time all-American with back-to-back academic all-America honors, one of the institution's most decorated student-athletes of all time.

By throwing four no-hitters in her senior year, including one perfect game, Southern closed out her college career having been named a four-time Western Athletic Conference pitcher of the year and twice leading the nation in ERA.

Her final record of 118 wins, 79 by shutout, ranks her in nine of the 11 NCAA Division I softball pitching marks. At Fresno State, she set 11 pitching records as well as six in the Western Athletic Conference.

Not one to focus on her individual achievements, Southern credits her teammates for the reason softball means so much to her.

Also meaningful, is Southern's work with the Fresno State "Big Hero-Little Hero" program, where student-athletes are able to lend spirit and cheer to seriously ill children and their families. Whether it is on the mound or in the service of those in need, Jamie Southern's work is an inspiration to all of us.

Ms. Lawson: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, DeMeco Ryans. DeMeco will receive his Top VIII Award tonight from Mal Moore, director of athletics, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. (Applause)

From the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Richelle Simpson. Richelle will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Harvey Perlman, chancellor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (Applause)

From the University of Portland, Christine Sinclair. Christine will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from Reverend E. William Beauchamp, president, University of Portland. (Applause)

From California State University, Fresno, Jamie Southern. Jamie will receive her Top VIII Award tonight from John D. Welty, president, California State University, Fresno. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: It is time for us to chat with the second half of our Top VIII honorees to talk about things that are important to them as student-athletes.

DeMeco, I will start with you. We saw in addition to your success as a football player with the Crimson Tide, you devote so much of your time to helping others in the community in need. Why is that so important to you?

Mr. Ryans: It is important to me because I feel that I was blessed and I had the resources to help people. Any time I feel someone is blessed like that and has the opportunity to do that, I think you should help people out.

Mr. Ford: Richelle, talking about time, and looking at your career as an athlete, we know that gymnastics takes up an extraordinary amount of an athlete's time for practicing. What sort of thoughts or messages would you offer to young student-athletes about how they can successfully juggle those time obligations?

Ms. Simpson: I think the best advice that I could give is to be organized with your academics and stay motivated. I think it is very important to stay motivated as a student and as an athlete in your sport throughout your career; and persevering through hard times and never giving up.

Mr. Ford: Christine, we saw you had clearly a very close relationship with your coach who you lost. What impact has these relationships with coaches and professors and teammates had on your life?

Ms. Sinclair: When I committed to the University of Portland, everyone told me you are going to love it. It is a family atmosphere. At the time, I was in high school and I said I didn't care, I just want to play. But looking back on it, my teammates have become my best friends. My coaches and professors have helped me out so much. Looking back, it was the best decision I ever made. It is not because we won the national championship, but because of the people I got to hang around with for four years.

Mr. Ford: Jamie, we talk often about not only our teammates here and the success that all of you have. I am curious about role models. With all your success, who is your role model?

Ms. Southern: I would be lying if I said I only have one role model. I think that when we go through stages of our athletic careers we start off wanting to be like Mike or to be that successful athlete. Then as we get a little bit older, we look to those who had the values and morals that our parents instilled in us, and we look for those role models.

I would have to say that being at the top level of my sport, I look to the veterans on the team as well as those who have been there and done that and who can supply that wisdom to me. I just hope there are young girls out there now that look to me as a role model.

Mr. Ford: I can assure that all four of you, from what we have learned, have now indeed become models for athletes. Congratulations from all of us. (Applause)

INSPIRATION AWARD

Mr. Ford: Tonight's NCAA Inspiration Award recipient can find hope even under the darkest of circumstances. While most inspiration honorees can pinpoint one moment that changed their lives, by the time he was six, he had already endured a series of heartbreaking moments that continually altered his life and defined his courage.

Audiovisual: Growing up in the South Bronx, on streets rife with gang warfare and drugs, Raul Altreche was no stranger to hardship. At the age of five, he lost his father to AIDS and in the months that followed, his mother grew weak, eventually succumbing to the same virus, leaving her son with the final words, "I love you" and "behave."

With the tragic loss of his parents, Altreche was forced to spend years bouncing between homes. Instability took its toll and he fell drastically behind in school. Entering junior high, yet barely able to read, Altreche sought the help of teachers and counselors and found his stride. His extraordinary efforts paid off with acceptance into a highly coveted and rigidly selective high school program where he not only became class president and a member of the National Honor Society, he discovered lacrosse—a sport that would change the path of his life.

As the prospect of college loomed, Altreche caught the eye of Tom Carmean, head coach of the Amherst College lacrosse team. Carmean saw something special in Raul and convinced Amherst College that they would be fortunate to have such a student-athlete attending their institution.

Against lifelong odds, Altreche was accepted, and though balancing athletics and academics has been no easy task, he has shined. Altreche has spent summer teaching at-risk children from backgrounds similar to his own, most recently through "Face to Face," a mentor program in Mount Kisko, New York.

Now a senior at Amherst, Raul continues to inspire and empower those around him by showing what incredible things can happen when a person is given a chance.

Mr. Ford: Though his early years were a study in tragedy and loss, his sheer enthusiasm and determination to succeed on the field and in the classroom, and to help those around him succeed as well, put him in a league of his own.

Ladies and gentlemen, from Amherst College, Raul Altreche. (Applause) Raul will receive his Inspiration Award from Kevin Graber, director of alumni and parent programs, Amherst College. (Applause)

RESPONSE—RAUL ALTRECHE

Mr. Altreche: Let me start by thanking the NCAA and the awards committee for this honor. Next, I would like to thank the ABC—A Better Chance—program for the support given to me all throughout high school. The people involved in that Madison ABC invested a lot of time and energy in me. Most importantly, they believed in me.

Madison ABC took a risk when they accepted me into their program. My reading and math scores were way below my peers. Nonetheless, they saw my drive and my attitude. I was willing to break through walls head first,

no excuses. The death of my parents was not a setback, it was a motivation. It was a reminder I had to do my best no matter what the situation. I thank God every day for providing me these opportunities and giving me the chance to see them as opportunities.

I stand here today in complete shock, not because of all the lights or all the cameras, but because I consider myself to be extremely lucky. As my lacrosse coach, Tom Carmean, mentioned, I was a one in a million chance. I was a one in a million chance because I was attending a New York public school that did not have enough resources, because I did not have enough money to take SAT classes.

I needed to overcome the daily obstacles of making it to school and home back safely, because I had to forge my way into a world that wants to package my life and personality into something everyone else can understand. I was never looking for the spotlight, just looking for a way to survive, a way to change the things around me.

I was lucky as the Better Chance program presented itself, and I was at a point in my life where I was willing to see it. I am thankful for these opportunities because I know there are a lot of parents, students and families looking for their chance—their chance to find a way out of the struggle.

But the second half is seeing the chance once it appears. It is surprising how hard it is to see an opening when you are accustomed to defeat. Needless to say, we still all have choices. We have the choice to struggle, we have the choice to continue fighting, and we have the choice to give up.

In most of my decisions, I had guidance. I need to thank my lacrosse coaches, Tom Carmean, Kevin Graber and all those people who have supported me and showed overall confidence in me. I want to thank Amherst College as an institution for accepting me. It was one of the best decisions I ever made.

I owe thanks to Ms. Priscilla McGinnis of Madison ABC for her dedication and compassion to the program. I owe a thank you to my host family, the Masons, who brought me to their family during high school and guided me during those years. I also have to thank Gary Union for spending countless hours with me filling out college applications, filling out financial aid packages, and most importantly for taking the role of parent during a critical time in my life. Thank you.

Lastly, the people I owe so much gratitude to are my family. They are always behind the scenes. Ironically, I recognize that in reality they probably didn't know what to do with my brothers and I after my parents died. They did the best thing they could have done—they gave us unconditional love.

I want to thank my brother, Moses, for being a weird mix of my father, brother and friend. I love you, brother, and happy birthday. I thank my Aunt Marian and Uncle Frank who loved my two brothers as if they were their sons. To my grandmother and grandfather in Florida, I say thank you.

We all need to remember the people in our lives who took risks for us, who gave us opportunities, and that memory needs to provide chances for others. Thank you, everyone, and take care. (Applause)

SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARDS

Audiovisual: One of Yale's most gifted running backs in history, Calvin Hill graduated in 1969 and became a first-round draft pick for the Dallas Cowboys, where he was selected NFL rookie of the year. Over the course of his career, he appeared in four Pro Bowls and two Super Bowls.

He is currently an activist and community leader with his alma mater, a member of the NCAA Leadership Council, and served on the Presidents Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome a fellow Yale football alumnus as well as a 1994 NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipient, my friend, Mr. Calvin Hill.

Mr. Hill: This year, the NCAA is celebrating many very important milestones, but one in particular is the 25th anniversary of the first NCAA women's championships in 1981. From Jackie Joyner-Kersey's stunning heptathlon titles at UCLA, to Olympic superstar Janet Evans breaking record after record in the pool, to the 2002 undefeated UConn women's basketball team capturing the NCAA title as over 3.5 million TV viewers looked on, for the past 25 years, the women of the NCAA have thrilled us all with their talent and drive.

Audiovisual: Just 25 years ago, NCAA women's championships were in their infancy, but what a difference 25 years can make. Twenty-five years ago, the NCAA first began to sponsor women's championships, and since

then an incredible number of opportunities have opened up to the female athlete.

The NCAA now offers female student-athletes the opportunity to compete in 44 championships, and more than 150,000 young women participate annually in NCAA intercollegiate athletics programs. A ticket to the 1982 Women's Final Four was \$7 and \$2.50 for a souvenir program. A total of 9,531 seats were sold for the final game between Louisiana Tech University and Cheyney State. Last year, the Women's Final Four had a sell-out of 28,937 in Indianapolis, the 13th consecutive sell-out in Women's Final Four history. Almost 500 media credentials were issued and it cost \$130 to attend the event as well as \$10 for a 152-page, full-color souvenir program. It certainly has been an incredible 25 years of growth and opportunity.

In 1997, women's rowing grew from an emerging sport to a full-fledged NCAA championship. In 2001, the NCAA added women's ice hockey and women's water polo to its growing list of intercollegiate championships. The inaugural NCAA Women's National Collegiate Bowling Championship became a reality in 2004 with eight teams competing for the title.

With the increased intercollegiate opportunities and the expanded television coverage of multiple women's sports events across the three divisions, young girls now know that their dreams can become realities as they enjoy the excitement and benefits associated with sports.

The first 25 years of NCAA women championships are a strong indication of the positive impact that opportunity can have on the lives of so many. The door continues to open wider for the future that will provide for many more milestones and celebrations.

Women's championships and women's athletics have become a vibrant part of our culture. With continued vision, we look forward to the next 25 years of NCAA women's athletics and championships.

Mr. Hill: Thanks to women like NCAA senior vice-president for championships and education services, Judy Sweet, the NCAA has taken on a whole new dimension in the form of women's athletics. Due to her tireless work, more than 150,000 female student-athletes had the opportunity to compete for national championship titles last year, and she certainly deserves a round of applause. (Applause)

In addition to the 25th anniversary of NCAA women's championships, there are several reasons to celebrate these past 25 years. This evening, we will commemorate them with the NCAA Silver Anniversary Award. This honor recognizes distinguished former student-athletes on their 25th anniversary as college graduates, and I am proud to be among the former honorees.

As past recipients, Jack and I cannot tell you how humbling and thrilling it is to be in the company of such athletic and world luminaries as Anita DeFrantz, Ann Meyers Drysdale, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Jack Nicklaus, Wilma Rudolph, Joan Benoit Samuelson, Roger Staubach, Captain John Stufflebeem, Pat Summitt and Bill Walton.

The NCAA Silver Anniversary Award, which represents a quarter century of societal contribution, will go to six worthy former student-athletes. The memories of their athletic achievements 2½ decades ago have not dimmed over the years. Rather, each former NCAA student-athlete has maintained a spirit of teamwork that has helped them do amazing things with their lives, as well as in the lives of others.

Let's meet our first three Silver Anniversary Award honorees.

Audiovisual: In her four years at the University of Virginia, Val Ackerman racked up over 1,300 points. But it was in the classroom where she scored her highest marks. The two-time academic all-American and three-season captain earned the Jettie Hill Memorial Award for the highest grade-point average among all University of Virginia female student-athletes.

As a benefactor of the early days of Title IX, Ackerman knew all too well the importance of opportunity. Working as a Big Sister in the NCAA Volunteer for Youth Program, she was recognized by the university with a distinguished award for her community service.

In 1985, Ackerman secured her law degree from UCLA. After a brief stint on Wall Street, she went on to work as a staff attorney for the NBA, later serving as a special assistant to commissioner David Stern. Her impact would be felt in ways perhaps not even she could have imagined.

One of the driving forces behind the creation of the U.S. women's national basketball team that won the gold in the 1996 Olympics, Ackerman was appointed the founding president of the newly organized WNBA.

She took charge quickly, growing the fledgling league from eight teams to a roster of 13, with games televised on three national networks. As the WNBA's pioneer, Ackerman helped establish it as one of the preeminent professional women's sports organizations in the country.

Today, she continues to break gender barriers as the first female president of USA Basketball. One of the most influential and powerful women in sports, Val Ackerman continues to blaze a trail for women on and off the court.

Danny Ainge once envisioned life on the baseball diamond. In 1977, drafted by the Toronto Blue Jays, Ainge played four seasons at second base while simultaneously attending Brigham Young University. It was in the off season, when Ainge was playing for the BYU basketball team, that it became clear how gifted this 6-4 guard was, and his life took a whole new direction.

In his senior year, Ainge averaged 24.4 points per game, with an equally stellar academic record. A two-time academic all-America pick, Ainge won the Eastman and Wooden Awards, and was named the nation's best collegiate player in 1981. When Ainge was drafted again this time, it was for the NBA's Boston Celtics.

His 14-year pro career playing alongside NBA greats like Larry Byrd, Kevin McHale and Robert Parish are unforgettable, and he has got two world championship rings to prove it. After turns as a coach and TV analyst, Ainge's career came full circle when he returned to Boston as the executive director of basketball operations for the Celtics.

Ainge is a doting father and grandfather, as well as a devout member of the Mormon Church, whose top priorities include his work as a spokesperson with United Families International and The Forever Young Foundation, which provides services to children facing significant physical, emotional or financial challenges. It is in this capacity that Danny Ainge's fire and enthusiasm is inspiring a whole new generation of fans.

Growing up in the inner-city projects of South Nashville, drugs, poverty and violence were the toughest opponents Charles Davis faced. Young Davis had hoped that he could somehow rise above it, and basketball offered him the opportunity.

Committed to his goal of becoming a professional basketball player, Davis became a standout at McGavock High School in Nashville, and then went on to Vanderbilt University. Davis, a two-time all-SEC selection, remains Vanderbilt's seventh all-time leading scorer.

Despite his hectic student-athlete schedule, he found time to volunteer at the Harris-Hillman School for the Handicapped, setting a precedent for community service that endures today.

In 1981, Davis was drafted by the NBA where he played with basketball superstars Michael Jordan and Scottie Pippen in an outstanding career that spanned more than a decade. So it is no surprise that Davis was inducted into the Tennessee Sports Hall of Fame in 1998. While his athletic achievements are praiseworthy, Davis wasn't satisfied with stats in a record book. He wanted to change the world.

Since 1992, his organization, the Charles Davis Foundation, has offered Nashville's urban youth an alternative to life on the streets. Through their "PEACE" initiative, an acronym for their mission to empower inner-city youths through positive, educational, athletic, cultural and economic development, children and their families now have a greater chance to realize their dreams. Named one of the 10 most influential African-Americans in Nashville sports history, Charles Davis is giving back by giving hope.

Mr. Hill: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Virginia, Val Ackerman. (Applause) Val will receive her Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Craig Littlepage, athletics director, University of Virginia.

From Brigham Young University, Danny Ainge. (Applause) Danny will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Gifford Nielsen, CHOU-TV sports director and 2003 NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipient. (Applause)

From Vanderbilt University, Charles Davis. (Applause) Charles will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Rod Williamson, director of sports information, Vanderbilt University. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: We are here to talk a little bit with our first three Silver Anniversary winners about things that have been important to them.

Val, part of our Centennial celebration is 25 years of women's college athletics. You have lived and experienced much of that. What are your thoughts on some of the more significant events in those 25 years?

Ms. Ackerman: There is no doubt that I have seen extraordinary change in women's college sports since I was at Virginia. I think without a doubt one of the most important changes is in the role of television, the media. We now have women's sports getting the exposure that only television can deliver.

When I was playing, we were all really laboring in obscurity. Now, there are hundreds of college teams every year in NCAA championships, and the Women's Final Four has turned into one of the most widely watched events. When you add to that the number of women playing, NCAA championships are great. There is a seriousness with which the programs are being administered now and the athletes themselves are pretty darn good. There's really been a profound change in the landscape.

Mr. Ford: Providing visibility and role models for young women?

Ms. Ackerman: Absolutely.

Mr. Ford: Danny, anybody who has watched you play was awestruck not only by your exceptional talent but by the heart and soul you brought to every game that you played. I think as we see what you have done in your life in the last 25 years, it is clear that you also brought that heart and soul to giving back to others. Why is that so important to you?

Mr. Ainge: If there is one thing that I have learned, Jack, that is happiness, joy and peace comes from giving and serving, and there are a lot of people who have inspired me and who continue to inspire me to do more. I am grateful for those inspirations, and I hope that I can continue to reach those goals. They are my heroes—the people who give their lives and sacrifice for others.

Mr. Ford: Charles, as with all of our recipients, you found fame and fortune and success. You proved that you can, in fact, go home again. It was important to you to go back home to Nashville. Why?

Mr. Davis: Because my roots are there. Where I grew up was not going to determine what I was going to become. A little boy with hard knocks in a city, I spent enough time at a basketball court looking through a fence. I looked up and I said: "God, if you ever gave me the opportunity to overcome my present situation, I will always come back and give back to the kids."

I want to make sure that all kids like me and the recipients here have the opportunity to pursue their goals in life. There are a lot of dreams, but we have the resources to be able to have outlets. We never had those things. I wanted to make sure that was something that was brought to the kids. I wanted to make sure that the 360,000 students who the NCAA says in the ad are going pro somewhere, and I wanted to make sure that they do.

Mr. Ford: You have our congratulations, not only for what you accomplished as student-athletes, but more importantly what you accomplished afterwards. Our congratulations to all of you.

Mr. Hill: When we introduced the first three Silver Anniversary Award honorees, we said that it is an award given to former NCAA student-athletes who spent the 25 years after their graduations making the world a better place. The same holds true for our next three Silver Anniversary Award recipients, who have devoted their energies to promoting health, fitness and literacy among children, as well as working to maintain access in equity for women in sports.

Let's take a look.

Audiovisual: For Dr. Terry Schroeder, water polo isn't merely a former college pastime, but a thread that's run throughout his entire life.

A graduate of Pepperdine University, Schroeder earned all-America honors three times and was the Waves' leading scorer three out of four years. Tapped to play for the national team, Schroeder helped them win their first-ever international water polo competition.

With his outstanding skill and dedication, he became the only water polo player ever to compete in four Olympics, serving as team captain from 1983 to 1992. An emotional highlight in his illustrious Olympic career came in 1988 when he was selected by Team USA to carry the American flag at the closing ceremony of the Seoul Games.

A magna cum laude graduate, Schroeder secured a degree in sports medicine as well as a postgraduate degree in chiropractic medicine. Today, he and his wife, Lori, own a chiropractic care facility that works with a number of worthy causes, including the Special Olympics, the YMCA and local children's organizations.

As head coach for Pepperdine's men's water polo team since 1986, Schroeder has led the Waves to eight

NCAA national championship berths and one NCAA championship title in 1997. Now in his 20th season, he has achieved all of this while still keeping his feet wet.

In the story of football, Mike Singletary is one of its more complex characters. As a linebacker at Baylor University, this four-time varsity letter-winner and two-year captain hit opposing ball carriers so hard his own helmet would crack. But off the field, Singletary showed a softer side.

After becoming a three-time all-American pick, capturing nearly every tackle record in Baylor history and being named the Southwest Conference defensive player of the decade, in 1981 Singletary was drafted by the Chicago Bears, where he played 12 prolific seasons.

The cornerstone of the Bears' defense, Singletary was twice named Associated Press player of the year, and led his team to seven playoff appearances, six division titles and victory in Super Bowl XX.

Though feared for his intense gaze on the field, Singletary was admired for his acts of kindness out of uniform. In 1992, he co-founded the Leadership Zone, an organization that provides leadership and motivation training using teamwork as a foundation to achieve success.

Today, Singletary is mentoring a new generation of football greats as assistant head coach and linebackers coach with the San Francisco 49ers. And while there is no doubt he enjoys being a member of the Baylor University College Football and the Pro Football Halls of Fame, it's his title as the National Fatherhood Initiative's "Father of the Year" that Singletary says is his proudest achievement to date.

Susan Wellington wasn't just a two-sport phenom in Yale's class of 1981. In a time when women's collegiate athletics were in their infancy, Susan Wellington was a pioneer.

Wellington not only earned all-Ivy honors playing shortstop on the softball team, but also excelled in the pool. As team captain and an all-American swimmer, she led the Bulldogs to their first Ivy League championship. In 1981, Wellington was awarded the prestigious William Leeming Jelliffe Leadership Award for demonstrating great development in swimming and outstanding leadership in the college community.

Of course, Wellington didn't stop at breaking gender barriers in athletics. After graduation, she rose from an entry-level marketing position with Quaker Oats to become the president of Gatorade USA. She was named one of Street & Smith's Sports Business Journals top-10 most powerful women in sports and earned Yale's George H.W. Bush Lifetime Achievement Award.

Wellington credits her sharp business instincts to the problem solving, team building and integrity she learned as a student-athlete at Yale. In 2005, she co-founded the Women's Intercollegiate Sports Endowment & Resource, a \$1 million fund to augment all women's athletic programs at Yale. She also serves on the board of the Women's Sports Foundation.

Because of women like Susan Wellington, the day has arrived where equity in athletics is more than just something that girls dream of.

Mr. Hill: Ladies and gentlemen, from Pepperdine University, Dr. Terry Schroeder. (Applause) Terry will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Andrew K. Benton, president, Pepperdine University. (Applause)

From Baylor University, Mike Singletary. (Applause) Mike will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Walter Abercrombie, associate athletics director from Baylor University. (Applause)

From Yale University, Susan Wellington. (Applause) Susan will receive her Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Frank Keefe, head men's and women's swimming and diving coach, Yale University. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: We have three more of our Silver Anniversary recipients, Dr. Terry Schroeder, Mike Singletary and Susan Wellington.

Terry, to you first, what experiences did you bring as a student-athlete to your role as a coach? Did it make you a better coach?

Mr. Schroeder: Definitely. My experiences as a student-athlete were really based around relationships with my coach Rick Rowan, in Pepperdine, and another man at Pepperdine, President Howard White. These gentlemen inspired me and encouraged me, and just helped me to make my dream come true. I think that really put in the back of my mind that I wanted to be a coach, that I wanted to help young student-athletes to be able to reach their dreams and inspire them.

Mr. Ford: Mike, I think we were all struck by the fact that with all of your athletic accomplishments and

achievements, you have said the most significant award you ever received was being named as father of the year. How do you think your experiences as a student-athlete helped you to be a better pop?

Mr. Singletary: I think more so than anything else, it taught me the spirit of leadership, and when you look at our country today, as you look at families and you look at kids, it is so important that fathers are there. When the fathers are there, it helps bring back what a mom can't do by herself.

Mom and dad working together do raise a family and make it work. That is hard work. So, for me it is a great achievement to be sending our kids out into the world prepared and equipped for the real war at hand.

Mr. Ford: Susan, it has been 25 years since you left Yale. You have done much for Yale. We, at Yale, have been and are very proud of your accomplishments and what you have given back to Yale and what you have given back to young women. Why is it so important to you?

Ms. Wellington: I don't have to tell you about giving back. You have given back to Yale, and you are giving back to the NCAA tonight. It is fantastic, and we are very proud of our Yalie. I give back like these guys—because I can and I should. I guess I'm standing on the shoulders of some pretty tall men at Yale and its 300 years of tradition—people like Phil Moriarty, Frank Keefe. I have got to stand on the shoulders of some incredible pioneers like Billie Jean King and Donna de Varona.

Because I got to stand on those shoulders, I got to be an athlete at Yale because of Title IX. I want for every girl to have that same chance—the chance to have the right to play but also the opportunity to play.

Mr. Ford: A father of a daughter who played at Yale, we are thankful for you. Winston Churchill said that you make a living by what you get and you make a life by what you give. The three of you and our other Silver Anniversary Award winners have given much to many. For that, we thank all of you. Congratulations.

INSPIRATION AWARD

Mr. Ford: Our third and final inspiration award recipient of the evening has been a source of pride for the NCAA for nearly 25 years. He has served as yet another beacon of hope for all whose lives he has touched. He was a student-athlete on the Princeton basketball team whose career was interrupted in 1944, when he was sent to train as a fighter pilot for World War II

The war ended before he could be deployed, and he returned to his alma mater and his team. Back at Princeton, his experiences with classmates from different regions led him to discover his calling in life. He went from defending his opponents on the court to defending the civil rights of Americans in a court of law.

Audiovisual: Whether it was as the captain of Princeton's basketball team or in his professional life, John Doar was immune to intimidation. However, the risks he was willing to take in the name of justice are what made him a true American hero.

The son of a teacher and a lawyer, Doar was destined to find his calling in the halls of justice. After graduating from Princeton with a degree in public and international affairs in 1944, the astute scholar pursued a career in law, earning his degree from the University of California in 1949.

During the critical and tumultuous years of the 1950s, Doar prospered in private practice in Wisconsin. But he was keenly aware that the civil rights movement was changing the cultural framework of society and sensed the real purpose of his life unfolding.

In 1960, Doar accepted a job as an assistant in the newly established civil rights division of the Justice Department. For the next decade, he defended the rights of Blacks across the South and risked his own life in the quest for racial equality. In his distinguished career, Doar was involved in some of the most significant legal events in history.

In 1962, he stood besides James Meredith as he became the first black man to register at the University of Mississippi. A year later, he calmed a riotous mob after Medger Evers' assassination. In 1964, he led the defense in the "Mississippi Burning" trial and acted as special counsel during President Nixon's impeachment hearing in 1974. For his profound contribution to society, Princeton bestowed upon him the Woodrow Wilson Award, as well as an honorary doctor of law degree.

John Doar has long enjoyed a successful private legal practice, but his true legacy is that of a man whose integrity and valor are woven in the fabric of our nation's history.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome, and our congratulations, Mr. John Doar. John will receive his Inspiration Award from Gary Walters, athletics director, Princeton University. (Applause)

RESPONSE—JOHN DOAR

Mr. Doar: I want to acknowledge the NCAA and the honors committee for honoring me. I want to recognize and acknowledge my family, who is here tonight, and those who supported me all those years in the '60s. They are really wonderful people and I love them all.

When you go back and recognize events that happened 35 to 45 years ago, you are in fact and in truth recognizing a lot of unknown black citizens who worked in the civil rights movement in the '60s—men like Bob Moses; the school teachers from Macon County, Alabama; truck drivers and bus drivers from all through the states of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama; sharecroppers in Haywood County, Tennessee; cotton farmers in East Carroll Parish, Louisiana; and some who are no longer with us, like Vernon Damon from Hattiesburg; and Mr. Lee and Mr. Allen from Emmet County, Mississippi.

Those men and women were the real heroes and really the persons primarily responsible for what has happened since then. I was a part of the civil rights division of the Department of Justice, which was made up of a very small group of young lawyers and young paralegals and secretaries who really believed that they were working in the best place they could in Washington.

The government is an awfully big place, and the Justice Department is pretty big as well. Many times, young lawyers asked me if they should work in the Justice Department. I'd say: "By all means, yes, if you can try to be there when the attorney general is the brother of the President." (Laughter)

We were supported by Harold Tyler, Burt Marshall and Robert Kennedy. They encouraged us to work, and we took up the challenge and we worked. Our assignment was to know the territory. We had to know Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi like the back of our hands.

We are faced with 100 years of culture and an unbelievable pattern of silence and hostility. But we did all we could to support these black heroes who struggled every day under unbelievable conditions, and we worked and worked and worked to help them as best we could. Finally, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed and the world changed.

A time or two a southern federal judge would say to me: "What do you want?" I would say: "We don't want white schools, we don't want black schools, just plain schools. We don't want white Americans, we don't want black Americans, just Americans."

Every year I see we are moving closer and closer to that goal. A good part of the credit for that is this organization, the NCAA. I thank you very much for it. Thank you. (Applause)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Audiovisual: Coach John Wooden has a long and storied history with the NCAA, including an unprecedented streak where he led UCLA's men's basketball team to 10 championship victories in 12 years, while nurturing the skills of great young players like Kareem Abdul-Jabbar and Bill Walton. Perhaps it was his unbeatable mix of philosophy and sound fundamentals that made him the first name to be elected to the Basketball Hall of Fame as both a player and a coach. Whatever the reason, John Wooden is a student of life and a coach's coach.

Mr. Ford: Here to present the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor bestowed by the NCAA, is the 1996 winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, as well as this year's NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award recipient. We are pleased to have with us the legendary, coach John Wooden.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Wooden: Thank you very much for that warm reception again. In a famous speech on citizenship, Theodore Roosevelt said: "It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by the dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short

again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions and spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who, at worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly; so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.”

Such appropriate words for past recipients of this honor—magnificent NCAA student-athletes and citizens like Jesse Owens, Dr. Sally Ride, who I held in my arms when she was a baby, Dr. Bill Cosby and Eunice Kennedy-Shriver. The NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award has been given to presidents of corporations, universities, and even a few Presidents of the United States, including Eisenhower, Ford, Reagan and George H.W. Bush.

They are all fitting company for this year’s recipient, Mr. Robert Kraft.

Audiovisual: Robert Kraft has always loved the New England Patriots. Raised in Brookline, Massachusetts, Kraft was an avid Pats fan, and though his father wanted him to become a Rabbi, he preferred life on the gridiron. Attending Columbia University on an academic scholarship, Kraft played football for the Lions for three seasons before an injury cut his career short.

With a student-athlete’s determination, he applied himself to his studies, graduating from Columbia in 1963, then attending Harvard business school on a fellowship. His first job was with the Rand-Whitney Group in Worcester, Massachusetts, and within a few years, Kraft had acquired ownership of the paper company.

The young businessman with four small boys of his own celebrated his good fortune with Patriots season tickets, and though the seats were cheap and the team usually lost, the Krafts were there every Sunday. As his business grew, so did Kraft’s dream of one day owning the team.

In 1985, Kraft embarked on a plan other investors might have laughed at. First, he purchased the 300 acres around Sullivan Stadium in Foxboro, and three years later he bought the stadium. Then in 1994, Kraft broke every business rule he had, buying the team with the NFL’s worst record four years running and taking on the Herculean task of turning them around.

He stated: “My objective in buying the Patriots is to help bring a championship to New England.” And with the help of coach Bill Belichick, and consummate team players like Tom Brady and Troy Brown, he has done that again and again, with four AFC titles and three Super Bowl championships.

Today, the state-of-the-art Gillette Stadium is the house that Kraft built. Right next to the stadium where he and his sons spent so many Sundays, it is the home of the Patriots and Kraft’s other winning team, major league soccer’s New England Revolution. And it is not the only stadium he has built.

To share the blessings athletics have brought to his family, Robert and his wife, Myra, have built community athletics facilities as near as Rhode Island and as far away as Jerusalem. The Krafts were instrumental in renovating an after-school center in Haifa for the Ethiopian community.

Locally, Kraft’s work on the executive committee of the Dana Farber Cancer Institute, the Robert K. Kraft Blood Donor Center and the board of the Boston Symphony Orchestra make him one of New England’s most generous humanitarians. As Kraft says, the driving forces in his life are the four F’s—family, faith, philanthropy and football.

A perpetually loyal and active member of the Columbia University community for over 40 years, Kraft served as a trustee for the maximum term of 12 years. For his distinguished service and accomplishment, he was awarded Columbia’s Alexander Hamilton Medal in 2004, the highest honor the university can bestow on an alumnus. And his gifts to the institution have repaid that scholarship he once received many times over.

Although he doesn’t take the field with his New England Patriots, Robert Kraft is, in every sense of the word, a world champion.

Mr. Wooden: Whether building a modest paper company into an empire, a stadium into the center of a new community, or a humble football team into a dynasty that’s working toward a fourth Super Bowl victory as we speak, he is a man who dares greatly and gives generously. It is my pleasure to present the 2006 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award to Mr. Robert Kraft.

And now, Mr. Robert Kraft. (Applause)

RESPONSE—ROBERT KRAFT

Mr. Kraft: Thank you for that kind and gracious introduction. You are a true champion, and it is an honor to be introduced by such an American sport legend. I sincerely regret I could not be there tonight to receive this award in person as we are hosting our first-round playoff game tonight. I was truly looking forward to sharing the night's festivities with all the other honorees, including one of our own special local legends, Danny Ainge.

Let me begin by congratulating all the award recipients who are honored tonight, including the Silver Anniversary, the Top VIII and Inspiration Award honorees. When I learned that I had won the award, I think I was more surprised to learn that I had even been nominated. It was flattering to learn that someone from my alma mater considered me worthy of such an honor, especially considering the distinguished class of past recipients.

Reflecting well on Columbia has always been extremely important to me, and to be the first graduate of the university to be so honored with this award is a source of great personal pride. I will always feel a debt of gratitude to Columbia.

The academic scholarship that the university extended to me has opened the doors to countless opportunities over the past 40 years. While at Columbia, I had the opportunity to play football, a sport that has had a profound impact on my life.

The lessons learned from competing in collegiate athletics have lasted a lifetime and gave me a greater understanding of the importance of teamwork, mental toughness and personal perseverance. Team sports teach you how to get along with people by breaking down stereotypes and artificial barriers created by different types of social and economic backgrounds.

As Theodore Roosevelt once said, the most important single ingredient in the formula of success is knowing how to get along with people. That is what I have always admired about team sports. When you win, you learn that celebrating team accomplishments are much more enjoyable than individual ones.

Whether it is as a fan or as a participant, team sports have a unique way of bringing people together, and if the locker room is not together, you won't win, no matter how many stars you have. I am very proud of everything our team has accomplished in recent years, not just on the field but off it.

Our team consists of individuals who are team-oriented and goal-driven, and they are men of great character and class, and represent my family and the New England region with great dignity.

Despite winning three of the last four Super Bowls, they remain humble and hungry. They remain focused on the future and don't dwell on the past. I think Theodore Roosevelt would have liked this New England Patriots team. It was President Roosevelt that used to say: "Speak softly and carry a big stick, you will go far." That approach has worked well for us and is tremendous advice. Thank you once again. I am humbled, honored and I am truly blessed to be receiving this award. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: And we are pleased that joining us now live from Foxboro is our recipient, Robert Kraft. Congratulations, Robert.

Mr. Kraft: Thank you, Jack. I am sorry I couldn't be there tonight. We are 7-0 at home in the playoffs. My family bought the team in '94. Not that I am a superstitious type, when it comes to playoffs, you turn to faith. Right now, we are winning seven to nothing. I thank you for your good comments.

It is now my pleasure to present the Theodore Roosevelt Institutional Award to my alma mater. To accept it, please welcome my good friend, Dianne Murphy, the director of intercollegiate athletics and physical education from Columbia University. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Robert Kraft, thank you so much for joining us and certainly good luck to all of you. Thank you all for being a part of the 2006 NCAA Honors Celebration and the rich 100-year history that is indeed the NCAA.

For a century, the NCAA has worked to blend the worlds of athletics and academia so that the student-athlete can flourish. Decade by decade, it has evolved and grown from a small group into a major association representing sports and institutions as diverse as its body of members. We certainly know that in the coming century, the NCAA will proudly carry on its mission in support of scholarship and sportsmanship.

CLOSING REMARKS

Before we leave this evening, I have one more note of congratulations for our honorees written in a letter by a fellow former NCAA student-athlete, who has gone on to a life of leadership—a letter from President George W. Bush.

It reads: “I send greetings to those gathered for the 2006 NCAA Honors Celebration. Congratulations to this year’s award recipients for your outstanding achievements.

“Athletics are an important part of our nation’s culture and our heritage. Participation in college athletics builds character and encourages fitness by challenging competitors both mentally and physically. By pursuing excellence on the field, athletes learn respect for their opponents and the value of discipline, hard work and sportsmanship. This year’s honorees have made great strides in their sport and in life, and this recognition is a fitting tribute to their accomplishments.

“I appreciate the recipients for your commitment to excellence. Your character and dedication inspire others and reflect the spirit of America.

“Laura and I send our best wishes on this special occasion.”

It is signed “President George W. Bush.” (Applause)

For those of you who want to re-live this evening’s NCAA magic, you can watch it again, January 31 at 3 p.m., Eastern time on ESPN2. The full version will also be airing on ESPNU January 10 at 10 p.m., the 11th at 5 p.m., and again on the 15th at 6 p.m.

Once again, our congratulations to all of our recipients and our thanks to all of you for sharing this celebration. Good night.

[The Honors Celebration was concluded at 9:30 p.m.]

DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE REVIEW FORUM

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 2006

The Legislative Review Forum was called to order at 9 a.m. by Division I Management Council member Kate Hickey, The State University of New Jersey, Rutgers, New Brunswick.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Hickey: Good morning. Welcome to the Division I Legislative Forum. My name is Kate Hickey. I am associate athletics director at Rutgers University. I represent the Big East Conference on the Division I Management Council, and I am also the chair of the Management Council's Subcommittee on Legislative Review, also known as the LRS, which is how I will refer to us today.

From now until 10:45, we are going to conduct the Legislative Forum, which we have done for the last couple of years, to provide some education on some of the proposals that will be voted on by the Management Council tomorrow and to give you an opportunity to discuss those proposals. At 11 a.m., we will begin the Division I business session, which will entail the override vote. Some other folks will get into that a little bit later. We are going to go until 10:45, have a quick break and then start up again at 11 with the business session.

By way of quick background, the LRS is in its third cycle of operation. It was formed by the Management Council in 2003 to help manage the legislative agenda and monitor proposals entering and moving through the structure. Before each Management Council meeting, the LRS meets to review and make recommendations on any proposals requested for consideration as noncontroversial and as emergency. The LRS also meets to review all proposals that are in the regulation legislative cycle after the release of the Official Notice in order to identify areas of question and to make recommendations to the Management Council in three categories:

One—Proposals that should be immediately approved and forwarded to the Board of Directors;

Two—Proposals that should be moved forward to the membership for formal comment; and

Three—Proposals that should not be approved or sent out for comment.

In conjunction with the Convention, we moderate this forum as a means of education and debate for you on the proposals that are up for consideration in this legislative cycle. Finally, before the April Management Council meeting, our group reviews all proposals that have gone out for comment. At that point, we will develop a consent package in order to assist the Management Council in streamlining its legislative work in April.

To prepare for today, we met in November 2005 to review each proposal in the Division I Official Notice. Our report was circulated earlier in this room. It is quite thick. You will notice it is about 70-some pages. I don't know if there are enough copies for each person, but hopefully we are all friends and you can look on with your neighbor and see the great information that is in that report. The proposals in the report are identified in three categories. As the proposals are listed, it is identified which category of the three I mentioned earlier we placed that proposal in or what our recommendation was to the Management Council in relation to each proposal. You can see that on the report. We also identified a number of proposals to discuss today. You should have an agenda that lists all of the proposals we will cover this morning. We will cover them in the order that they are listed on that agenda, which does not necessarily follow the order they are in the Official Notice. We will give you page references and hopefully keep everybody up to speed.

The purpose of this session is to education and debate. Most of the Management Council members are here, and one of our goals is to have an opportunity to hear debate on the proposals. The Management Council will first vote on these proposals tomorrow, so no votes have been taken as of yet. The debate—positive, negative or somewhere in the middle—will be very helpful for each of us in making our votes tomorrow. This forum is going to be what you make of it. We will be here to provide information. We hope that there will be some debate and discussion on the proposals and the questions that come up.

Other items that are at your table are copies of the PowerPoint presentation that you will see in relation to each proposal and position papers from some constituent groups. I am going to quickly run through the forum's format, and then we will get to business.

Proposals will be discussed in the order in which they appear on the agenda that was provided to you. Each proposal highlighted for discussion will be presented by one of the LRS members. I will have them introduce themselves in a moment. Each individual will note the number of the proposal, the title, the intent statement, any comments relative to the proposal and the LRS position on the proposal. Once we run through that information, the floor will be open for discussion. As you can see, we have eight microphones identified by number, so we are ready to roll.

As we discuss a particular proposal and you would like to speak on it, please approach a microphone early. We want to try to make this happen as efficiently as possible. If you do speak, please identify yourself by name and affiliation before speaking. Once we have presented and heard discussion on the highlighted proposals, we will open everything up for any other proposals that folks want to talk about or anything that we have not identified. There likely will be interpretive questions today. We have folks from the staff here to address those issues. I know you understand that all issues will not be answered today, but these folks will take down your questions and we will make sure that answers are provided at some point in the very near future.

There are three subcommittee members who are not here for various reasons: faculty athletics representative (FAR) Jo Potuto, from the University of Nebraska; FAR Scott Kretchmar from Penn State University; and FAR Ken Casavant from Washington State University. We appreciate what they do on the subcommittee. I would now like other LRS members to introduce themselves.

[Note: Legislative Review Subcommittee members introduced themselves as follows: Alison Cone, director of athletics at California Polytechnic State University, representing the Big West Conference; Ted Gumbart, associate commissioner at the Atlantic Sun Conference, and a I-AAA member of the Management Council; Helen Grant, associate commissioner of the Sun Belt Conference, representing the Sun Belt Conference; Jackie Campbell, associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference, representing the Atlantic 10 Conference.]

Ms. Hickey: Would our staff members please introduce themselves as well?

[Note: NCAA staff members Steve Mallonee, Lynn Holzman and Leeland Zeller introduced themselves.]

Ms. Hickey: Thank you. We have three sections in which we do not have proposals selected. If you have questions on those sections, we are going to take them at the end of the forum if time permits. The three categories are academic performance program, administrative and executive regulations, and committees. If you do have a proposal identified that you have questions on for those three sections, please save that until the end of the forum.

We are going to jump into amateurism. I am going to ask Ted Gumbart to lead us through that area.

PROPOSAL FORUM

AMATEURISM—INSTITUTIONAL, CHARITABLE, EDUCATIONAL OR NONPROFIT PROMOTIONS—SALE OF ITEMS BEARING NAMES, LIKENESSES OR PICTURES OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

Mr. Gumbart: Thank you, Kate. The first proposal that we have identified as the subcommittee to bring to this group for review is 2005-25. It is on Page 23 in your Notice. It involves the sale of items bearing names, likenesses or pictures of student-athletes. The intent of the proposal is to specify that commercial items with names, likenesses or pictures of multiple student-athletes, other than highlight films or media guides, may be sold only at the member institution at which the student-athlete is enrolled, institutionally controlled outlets, or outlets controlled by a charitable or educational organization. Further, it specifies that items that include an individual student-athlete's name, picture or likeness, other than informational items, may not be sold.

It is important to recognize the change that this presents from the current bylaw, which does allow certain items like this to be sold. The change is to prohibit the sale of individual items such as jerseys or bobble heads. It does allow for these items to be presented as a give-away, but they may not be sold.

On the screens, you can see the points that the committee considered in making this recommendation. It does enhance our philosophical commitment to amateurism by not selling these individual items. Again, it allows them to provide them as giveaways. It restricts the institution from selling specific items that have a jersey name

or an individual student-athlete's likeness. After consideration of those points, our committee's recommendation was to send the proposal out for comment and vote on it in April. That is the committee's position. If folks have comments they want to bring to the floor for discussion of this item, I will entertain those at this time.

Kristine Lara (University of Alabama at Birmingham): I am a softball student-athlete representing the student-athletes from Conference USA.

On behalf of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we urge you to support this proposal. By implementing this proposal, it would shift the focus from an individual student-athlete and place it on a team. This will also eliminate the exploitation of the superstar student-athletes. Currently, these superstar student-athletes are being commercialized by institutional entities. This has no benefit to student-athletes.

At the national leadership conference, we had a student-athlete approach us and say: "My school is selling a jersey with my name and my number on the back of it, but we are not receiving any money." The national SAAC was flabbergasted.

Currently, the rule allows these institutional outlets to use the name, likeness and appearance of student-athletes. This is crossing the line between professionalism and amateurism. By supporting this proposal, it would further separate the difference between professional sports and amateur sports. The Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal 2005-25. Thank you.

AMATEURISM—PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES—INSTITUTIONAL CHARITABLE, EDUCATIONAL OR NONPROFIT PROMOTIONS

Mr. Gumbart: The next proposal we selected for discussion is 2005-26, which involves promotional activities for institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit promotions.

We believe there is a need for further education about this proposal at this forum. The national staff put together a short video that many of you may have seen on the Internet. That is a tool that is available to you. To get it from the NCAA home page, go to the legislation and governance tab and click on rules and bylaws. Underneath the proposed legislation, click on legislative actions and issues. The next screen shows a Division I listing of Proposal 2005-26 video. That piece of educational material outlines in detail what I am going to briefly read to you.

The intent of this proposal is to revise the restrictions related to the use of a student-athlete's name, picture or appearance in institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit promotional activities, as specified. The key word there is "revise." We currently have legislation that governs this, but it is for printed material. In today's multimedia digital world, I think the consensus is that this rule does not serve current reality about how we present information to the public and various constituents. But whether this proposal is the resolution that is needed is why it is on the table at this forum.

The points on the screen provide clarification on when and how the activities may be presented. It does involve more flexibility. Some things through the Internet and the digital world that are not allowed now would be; but, it is kind of a transition from print to digital media. There is a potential perception-wise that further attachment of any team, name or student to a corporate identity does present a perception of a change toward commercialism, but really this is just a revision of something we have currently on the books.

Finally, we have the 25-percent limit. It is very easy to understand on paper how much of the paper you have covered. On an Internet banner ad, they blink on, they blink off. They might float across the screen. How do you determine exactly what 25 percent is? So, there are some recognized items that challenge us for this legislation, which is why this committee has decided it does need to be sent out for comment and further input from the membership. The group's recommendation is to send it out for comment.

Ms. Hickey: I would just make mention that the video materials that Ted spoke about were provided by the staff in reaction to a directive provided by the Management Council. It was something that the Management Council asked the staff to put together because there certainly was a significant amount of confusion, even on our part, especially about the 25-percent standard. Are there any questions or statements on this proposal? Okay. We will move right along.

AMATEURISM—PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES—PERMISSIBLE—CONTINUATION OF MODELING AND OTHER NONATHLETICALLY RELATED PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES AFTER ENROLLMENT

Mr. Gumbart: The third proposal we have got in the amateurism category is 2005-67. It can be found on Page 36. It involves a permissible continuation of modeling and other nonathletically related promotional activities after enrollment.

The intent is to remove the condition that a student-athlete's involvement in modeling in other nonathletically related promotional activities must be initiated before his or her enrollment at a member institution. The key to the legislation is that it is a change to what we currently have in place—that you must have started your modeling activity before you enrolled. This proposal would allow you to begin modeling activities after you have enrolled as a student-athlete at one of our member institutions.

As you can see, some of the key points that the committee considered were that it does open up an opportunity. It enhances the student-athlete's ability to participate in this activity. If the opportunity, for whatever reason, was not presented to the student-athlete until after they enrolled, the people who proposed the legislation feel they should still be able to participate in that activity. On the opposite side of the ledger, there is some possibility that those open it up for exploitations. If you begin a modeling career after your enrollment, the legislation says that it must be nonathletically related, but we felt as a committee that it opened up a lot of possibilities for exploitation of student-athletes. For example, a commercial entity may enlist your modeling activities, but purely for athletic reasons. It is very difficult to try to draw that line as to why some third party might ask you to model.

After discussion, the committee did decide to recommend defeat of this proposal. It is in the package for defeat by the Management Council, but that vote is Sunday. At this point, we would like to open the floor for input from this group on 2005-67.

Ms. Hickey: Seeing nobody approaching the microphone, we are going to go ahead and move on to awards, benefits and expenses. Thanks, Ted, for that amateurism information. Alison Cone will present this section to you.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS—MEDICAL EXPENSES—PERMISSIBLE

Ms. Cone: Thank you, Kate. We have selected two proposals in the awards and benefits section. The first is Proposal 2005-101. It can be found on Page 97 of your Official Notice. The intent of this is to specify that permissible medical expenses, including surgical, medication, rehabilitation, physical therapy and dental expenses shall be limited to athletically related injuries or illnesses that occurred during the academic year or summer.

This basically returns the legislation to the previous rule before the passage of Proposal 2003-139, which was passed in 2004. Medical expenses not permitted under this legislation could still be provided via the student-athlete opportunity fund.

The Division I membership recently debated this issue. There wasn't any new information that would suggest the change in the rule. The institutions would lose the autonomy to provide medical expenses as they deem appropriate for student-athletes. Obviously, it provides less flexibility for institutions and might be contrary to the student-athlete's well-being. The LRS, after considering these points, has recommended defeat of this proposal. At this time, I would like to open it up to the floor for discussion.

Carolayne Henry (Mountain West Conference): On behalf of the Mountain West Conference, we urge your support. At the very least, we would urge that you put it out for comment to the membership.

When the Mountain West Conference came up with this proposal, there were several concerns that we addressed, one of which was a competitive equity issue. The second was gender equity. We may run into situations in which you have an injury that is outside athletics. For example, a male student-athlete may be in the sport of football and a female student-athlete in the sport of women's soccer. An institution would have to determine perhaps which student-athlete would get those benefits.

We ask that you look at the proposal on the merits rather than just deciding that since it has only been in effect for one year that it should not be changed. In addition, if you take a look at the current legislation, it is likely that an institution will be faced with issues related to equity when determining which student-athlete should receive expenses for nonathletically related injuries or illnesses because of limited resources. There is also potential for significant one-time medical/dental expenses that could greatly impact an institution's budgeted expenditures for medical expenses. However, the Special Assistance and Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund could be used to cover some of the expenses that the current legislation already covers.

On behalf of the Mountain West Conference, I urge your support. At the very least, put this proposal out for comments so the membership could have a little more time to take a look at it.

Spencer Tatum (Ohio University): Good morning. I am representing the student-athletes of the Mid-American Conference. The national student-athlete advisory committee opposes the legislation for a couple of reasons.

One of the main reasons is that you are taking away a great opportunity for student-athletes that was granted to them. This opportunity allows the institution to provide medical expenses outside the athletic field. We feel this is very good for student-athletes and could be needed. Also, the current legislation is permissive. It is at the institution's discretion on where they want to use it and how they want to use it and if they want to use it. This is another key fact that the national SAAC looked into and that we ask you to look into as well. The third point is student-athletes have fought for this for years and years and years. They are so passionate about this. We feel by taking this away, this proposal is taking away from what we have worked so hard, and it is a huge step back for us. We urge you as the national SAAC, as student-athletes, that you oppose this proposal. I thank you for your time. Have a great time here in Indianapolis.

Tom Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I certainly concur with that gentleman's remarks. The Pac-10 sponsored the current legislation, because as a simple matter our trainers and doctors do treat these nonathletic injuries.

Whatever one does to get the student-athlete back into competition, we didn't want to be in violation of the rule. This has only been in effect this current academic year. No one even has any experience with this yet. I commend the LRS for advising us to defeat it. Let's let this work for a couple of years at least before we try to revisit it.

Ms. Hickey: Thanks, Tom. Is there any further discussion? I don't see anybody. We are going to move to 2005-102.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS—MEDICAL EXPENSES—PERMISSIBLE—MEDICAL INSURANCE

Ms. Cone: The other proposal in the awards and benefits section is Proposal No. 2005-102. It can be found on Page 99 of your Official Notice. This involves medical insurance.

The intent is to permit an institution to purchase a medical insurance policy to cover the medical expenses for any injury or illness sustained by the student-athlete. This would expand current legislation and provide greater autonomy for institutions to not only provide medical expenses but also general health insurance. It provides institutions with greater flexibility. It is permissive legislation. It might be a potential cost savings for institutions for a blanket insurance policy in lieu of actual medical expenses.

There are some competitive equity concerns, and this might represent potential additional costs for institutions. The recommendation of the LRS is that this proposal be forwarded to the membership for further review and comment. I will now open it to the floor for comments. Going once, going twice.

Ms. Hickey: Are there any other proposals in that section that anybody would like to address at this time?

We are going to move on to a few eligibility proposals that Jackie Campbell is going to walk us through at this time.

ELIGIBILITY—PROGRESS TOWARD DEGREE—NONTRADITIONAL COURSES

Ms. Campbell: The first two proposals I would like to talk about are 2005-49-A and -B. Both of these proposals deal with the use of nontraditional courses, such as distance-learning, correspondence, extension and

credit by examination courses completed at an institution other than the certifying institution to meet the 24/36 credit hour and/or percentage-of-degree requirements, provided the courses satisfy the current legislation on distance-learning courses, they receive prior approval by the appropriate academic officials from the certifying institution and are accepted by the certifying institution for degree credit. Both proposals allow you to use these courses. However, in Proposal 49-B, the difference is that they limit the number of courses to six semester or nine quarter credits for the academic year. Essentially, both of the proposals are the same except the second one provides you with a limit of the number of credits that you can earn.

The points that were considered, on the one hand, student-athletes would have the same opportunity to take these types of courses as a regular student and would offer some flexibility in their scheduling; and the courses do have to meet your normal institutional requirements applicable to all students for such courses. On the other hand, some people question the validity of such courses. They are not taught in the traditional classroom format. Also, they can only be used to meet the 24/36 credit hour requirement and percentage-of-degree requirements. You can't use them to meet the six-hour requirement or the 18-credit-hour requirement.

Is there any discussion on these proposals?

Sandra Meyer (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): The National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics supports this legislation in principle. However, although we believe that it is a progressive piece of legislation given that nonstudent-athletes are permitted to use nontraditional courses provided they are accepted for degree credit by their institutions, it could obviously lead to some sort of abuse.

This proposal should not move forward until a definition is firmly established for distance learning. Does it include on-line courses or is it subject to only paid percent tiered curricula? We also would like the voters to keep in mind that student-athletes on athletics scholarships would not pay for these courses if they were taken at an institution other than their own.

So the NAAAA supports both A and B in principle, and particularly B, because it does limit the number of nontraditional courses that could be used for progress toward degree. Thank you.

Jackie Blackett (Columbia University-Barnard College): I am currently chair of the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet. I just wanted to point out to the membership that the AEC Cabinet spent a year meeting with experts on these sorts of courses. We also spent that year speaking with institutions that have utilized these courses. We recommend approval of 49-A.

Ms. Campbell: Just for everyone's information, the LRS group has recommended that both the proposals go out for comment. When the Management Council gets these proposals with their information, that will be our recommendation.

ELIGIBILITY—FIVE-YEAR PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY— TRANSFER STATUS AND PROGRESS TOWARD DEGREE

Ms. Campbell: Our next proposal is No. 2005-52, which can be found on Page 57 of the Official Notice. This proposal would specify that a student-athlete who is registered as a full-time student on the first day of classes would start the five-year period of eligibility. He or she would be subject to progress-toward-degree requirements and would be considered a transfer student.

The points to consider in this proposal includes the fact that it would provide consistency in applying the "triggers" for the start of your five-year clock, whether you are subject to progress-toward-degree requirements and whether or not you are a transfer student.

On the other hand, you may consider this too harsh, because you could register for a full-time load of classes. You trigger your five-year clock, transfer status and progress toward degree, and you might never set foot on campus. So, those are some of the things to consider.

The LRS group also expressed concern about the difficulty in the application of such a rule and, therefore, we have actually recommended that this proposal be defeated. Any comments?

Sandra Meyer (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): The Empire 8 does not support this proposal. We have two concerns. One, some institutions register incoming student-athletes before they are on campus in order for them to have the same course selection as other incoming students. Each university should

determine when a student-athlete is considered full-time based on the university's guidelines. Secondly, student-athletes enrolled but never planning to attend the institution are technically enrolled the first day of classes. However, they may have never thought about handling the administrative requirements to cancel enrollment if they change their minds.

Ms. Hickey: Thank you. Are there any additional comments?

ELIGIBILITY—SEASONS OF COMPETITION—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Ms. Campbell: Our next proposal is 2005-108, which is on Page 85 in your Official Notice. In the sport of football, this would permit a student-athlete to engage in five seasons of competition within five years of the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

One of the points to consider in this is if it actually result in higher graduation rates, why only football? How are nonqualifiers going to be addressed? Is the effective date clear? Is there retroactive application? You see the number of issues listed in the slide. Since we put this presentation together, we have received information from the sponsors that they plan to withdraw this proposal at the Management Council meeting tomorrow. Are there any comments?

Ms. Hickey: Seeing no one approaching a microphone, we are going to move into personnel and coaching limitations for a minute, and then come back to transfer eligibility issues. Jackie is going to walk us through both of those sections.

PERSONNEL—COACHING LIMITATIONS—SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL —RECRUITING FUNCTIONS

Ms. Campbell: Proposals 2005-77-A and -B, which start on Page 40 of the Official Notice, deal with sports other than football and recruiting functions. It would specify that all recruiting coordination functions be performed by a countable coach, and that in all applicable sports you permit a volunteer coach to engage such activities if they have been certified to recruit off campus.

So, 77-A allows a volunteer coach to participate in the same activities if they have been certified to recruit off campus. Now, 77-B would just indicate that all recruiting coordination functions would have to be performed by your head or assistant coaches. The difference between the two is one allows your volunteer coaches to perform these activities and one doesn't. As far as what constitutes recruiting activities, it would be similar to what we now do in the sport of football. So there is legislation in Bylaw 11 that lays out what that means. It does support competitive equity and coaching limitations, we currently have the rule in football, and it would be defined the same way.

Our group has looked at this, and we recommend that it be forwarded to the membership for comment. I would like to note that there are a few revisions from your Official Notice as far as the language within the proposal. In the orange book that you have—the Convention Program—on Pages 5 through 8 you will see some slight revisions in the proposals in that book.

Are there any comments?

Ms. Hickey: Are there any comments from the sponsors of the legislation?

Beth Bass (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): As it relates to 77-A and -B, currently we don't have any WBCA membership feedback at this time. Our association does support control in limitations. We also believe it is a very valuable experience for a graduate assistant and director of basketball operations to learn the recruiting process.

This thought runs congruent with our "So You Want To Be A Coach Program?" Many of our participants get their first foot in the door of their coaching experience, and it is very valuable in these entry-level positions to understand the recruiting process. Furthermore, we would ask for the consideration of surveying and discussing this with our membership, and to better define and clarify the recruiting coordination activity. Therefore, at this time, we would ask the Management Council to defeat both Proposition 77-A and -B, or move them both forward for further review. Thank you.

Ms. Hickey: Thank you. Are there any comments on 77-A and -B? We are going to bounce back to transfers and have Jackie take us through that.

ELIGIBILITY—GRADUATE STUDENT OR POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION—TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY

Ms. Campbell: The next proposal is No. 2005-54, which can be found on Page 60 of your Official Notice. This basically permits a student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics regardless of any previous transfer.

In the current rule, if you want to participate at an institution other than the one from which you received your baccalaureate, you have to meet the one-time transfer exception. That would eliminate that requirement. So this is student-athlete friendly. If student-athletes have earned their undergraduate degree and would like to pursue a graduate degree at another institution, they will be able to go there and participate if they have any seasons of competition remaining and time left on the clock.

This included all graduate students, if they have time left on their clock. One concern I think people have is it could increase recruitment at the graduate level. That was one of the things mentioned about the proposal.

Our group recommended that it be forwarded to the membership for review and comment.

ELIGIBILITY—TRANSFERS—ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION—STUDENT-ATHLETE NOT RECRUITED BY ORIGINAL FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION

Ms. Campbell: Another transfer proposal is No. 2005-82, which can be found on Page 75 of the Official Notice. This would be in the sports of basketball, football and men's ice hockey. It would allow student-athletes who were not recruited by their original four-year institution and who have never received athletically related financial aid to be eligible for the one-time transfer exception.

Basically, this proposal goes to student-athlete well-being. It provides an exception for nonstudent-athletes who have never received an athletics scholarship. It would apply to all sports, so now your current sports that are not able to use the one-time transfer exception could use it in a limited instance. Currently, in some situations, there has been relief sought through the Administrative Review Subcommittee. Our group has recommended that this proposal be forwarded to the membership for comment and review.

Ms. Hickey: Are there any comments or questions?

ELIGIBILITY—TRANSFER—ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Ms. Campbell: Proposal No. 2005-109, which is found on Page 88 of your Official Notice, would specify that a student-athlete who transfers from a Division I-A institution to a I-AA institution would qualify for the one-time exception only if they have two or more seasons of competition remaining.

The current rule in football is if you are going from I-A to I-AA, you can use the one-time transfer exception. This would limit it to only if the individual had two seasons of competition remaining.

Some points to consider are that there is concern that those students who have two or more seasons remaining would be able to use it. It could deter transfers due to athletics motives. Another reason to consider is why does this apply only to football and how to apply it to student-athletes who transfer at mid-year. Those are some of the things that were brought up on that issue. Our position was to send this out for comment and review.

ELIGIBILITY—TRANSFER—ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION —DIVISION III AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Ms. Campbell: Our next proposal is 2005-110, which is on Page 90 of the Official Notice. It again deals with transfers. It would limit the one-time transfer exception to a student-athlete who transfers from a Division III institution to a Division I institution; or graduate student from any four-year collegiate institution who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the one from which he or she received their baccalaureate degree.

This is another proposal that supports student-athlete well-being. It could reduce the number of transfers for athletics reasons. It could possibly increase recruitment at the graduate level. Also, if the student-athlete does not transfer because of this change, does it result in a positive impact on the team culture? It further restricts the one-

time transfer exception in sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey. The committee's position was to defeat this proposal.

ELIGIBILITY—TRANSFER REGULATIONS—FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE —ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION—BASEBALL

Ms. Campbell: Proposal No. 2005-111, which is on Page 92 of the Official Notice, would specify that the one-time transfer exception is not available to a baseball student-athlete. Apparently, baseball has one of the highest transfer rates and the lowest academic progress rates. It could possibly reduce incentives to transfer for athletics reasons.

Why just pick baseball and no other sports? How will this affect the culture of baseball? Our group's position was to send this out for review and comment.

Ms. Hickey: Any comments or questions on the transfer proposals?

We are getting ready to move on to a new section. This is your last opportunity until maybe later on. We are going to move to some real exciting stuff—financial aid. I know everybody is pumped up about that. Helen Grant is going to walk us through this section.

FINANCIAL AID—TERMS AND CONDITIONS—PERIOD OF AWARD

Ms. Grant: We have Proposal 2003-24 and the 2003-24-1 amendment. I will make it exciting. How about that? The proposals are on Page 100 and 103 of your Notice. The intent of 2003-24 is to require an institution to award athletically related financial aid for a period of one academic year, except as specified, which you will see in Bylaw 15.3.3.1, with the exceptions in 15.3.3.1.1 that are in the Notice. You will see that on Page 101.

The intent of 2003-24-1 basically amends 2003-24 to permit an institution to award athletically related financial aid to a student-athlete for a period of less than a full academic year when the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or the final quarter as specified. Further, the amendment would require an institution to offer full-year aid awards in equal amounts for each term of the academic year.

The subcommittee discussions, we pointed out that 2004-24 requires the institution to provide athletically related aid for a full academic year, which certainly supports student-athlete well-being. The institution would demonstrate its commitment to the student-athlete. The amendment and amendment-to-amendment provides limited exceptions to the one-year aid agreement requirement. The subcommittee also noted that the equal amounts of the four-year award could be based either on a percentage of the grant or an equal dollar amount, contingent on the institution's policy for awarding aid, and noted that the institution is still permitted to reduce or cancel aid during the award under legislative options, such as voluntary withdrawal from the team.

The group suggested that both be forwarded to the membership for comment. We will welcome any of your comments.

Gerald Lage (Oklahoma State University): I think we should point out since there are some very good coaches here who also feel we are going to be leaving aid on the table that student-athletes could have if they are allowed to have these semester awards. So it is not all plus.

Benjamin Hanson (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I am a cross country and track runner at the University of Minnesota, and I am representing the student-athletes of the Big Ten Conference.

Over the years, the membership has passed legislation that protects the financial security and the financial well-being of student-athletes. As a Division I SAAC, we want this trend to continue. We feel that Proposal 2003-24 has three benefits for student-athletes, and all of them speak to our well-being.

First, this proposal would increase our financial security, meaning for a period of one year we will know exactly how much money we are going to receive, therefore, we can determine on our own if we need to take out loans or if we need to pick up a part-time job in order to pay for school. Second, this proposal would show an increased commitment from the institution to us as student-athletes, and hopefully we would reciprocate that commitment back to the institution. Third, as student-athletes, we have a lot of pressure in our lives. We have pressure to perform in the classroom, we have pressure from our family and we have pressure from our peers. This proposal would eliminate some of the pressure we feel in our lives. Any time you can eliminate some pressure, the student-athletes feel it will help them in their ultimate goal, and that is in achieving a college degree.

We do recognize the concerns brought up just recently that this proposal could take away from some of the autonomy granted the coaches when it comes to dividing up their scholarships. However, the increased financial security and the well-being of student-athletes in general outweigh any lost autonomy by the coaches. Therefore, the Division I SAAC supports Proposal No. 2003-24 and the amendment, 2003-24-1. Thank you for your time.

Chandra Bierwirth (George Washington University): If you have a kid who you would like to give money to just for the spring and then after the fall semester you decided that you would like to give them aid for the spring, how would this technically affect giving an award for just one semester after the fall is already concluded? Does this proposal prohibit that?

Ms. Hickey: There is a one-time exception. You could provide a single-term award to an individual who has not been on athletics financial aid previously. Thank you.

Are there any further comments or questions? Great. Thanks so much.

FINANCIAL AID—ELEMENTS OF FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER FINANCIAL AID AND ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES—PROPORTIONALITY

Ms. Grant: The next two proposals—2005-46-A and 46-B—are related to summer aid and can be found on Pages 107 and 109 of your Notice.

The intent of Proposal 46-A is to eliminate the requirement that athletically related summer financial aid must be awarded in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid a student-athlete received during the previous academic year.

The intent of 46-B is to specify that athletically related summer financial aid is not required to be awarded in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid a student-athlete received during the previous academic year, provided the student-athlete is enrolled in a degree program that will qualify the student-athlete to earn a baccalaureate degree within five years of initial full-time enrollment and has completed his or her third or fourth year of collegiate enrollment and has completed 60 percent or 80 percent, respectively, of the course requirements of his or her specific degree program.

These proposals provide institutions with greater flexibility in awarding institutional financial aid for summer school. The main difference between 46-A and 46-B is that 46-B limits the awarding of aid without proportion to student-athletes in their third or fourth year of enrollment and completing 60 or 80 percent of their degree program, respectively.

The subcommittee felt that the proposals could create college competitive equity concerns, and they still state that the student-athlete must have received aid during the previous academic year to also receive such summer aid. The subcommittee recommended that 46-A be defeated and to send 46-B to the membership for comment.

Arvin Grabel (Northeastern University): I have a question. We have a basic five-year program. Are we allowed a sixth year?

Ms. Hickey: Could you clarify the question for us a little further?

Mr. Grabel: You said that the aid to someone who gets a degree has to be within five years. I would assume that giving the student the extra year is for a typical four-year institution. Because of our co-op program, our normal program is a five-year program. Do we get a sixth year?

Ms. Hickey: Of athletics aid?

Mr. Grabel: Not of athletics aid, but to follow this legislation. I have a second question along that same line. Summer school is an inherent part of our program. Students alternate their activity in order to get their degree in which they spend six months in class and six months in co-op. How does that work with your program of how you are allowed to give summer financial aid? That is our academic year. It is not September to the end of May.

Steve Mallonee (NCAA Staff): First of all, this proposal doesn't change the time period for which you can receive aid. So under the current rules, you have always been able to get five years of aid within a six-year time period. So you potentially have that fifth summer.

One of the alternatives that talks about the proportionality requirement ties it to the third or fourth year of enrollment, completing 60 or 80 percent of the program. It doesn't go on to speak in terms of a sixth-year program and where you would need to be.

We probably would need to clarify that issue or go with the 80 percent in a standard sense since that is the latter standard. That is what we probably would do.

FINANCIAL AID—ELEMENTS OF FINANCIAL AID—DETERMINATION OF OFF-CAMPUS ROOM AND BOARD COSTS

Ms. Grant: Next is Proposal 2005-48, which can be found on Page 112 of your Notice. The proposal's intent is to permit an institution to calculate off-campus room and board costs based on its policies and procedures for calculating the cost of attendance for all students.

This proposal does promote student-athlete well-being. It provides institutions with greater flexibility in providing room and board costs for student-athletes living off campus. It could be more reflective of the cost of living in the locale of the institution. However, in view of that and the differences in the cost of living from campus to campus, the proposal could create competitive equity issues. Also, it could be used improperly as a recruiting incentive. The subcommittee voted to forward this to the membership for comment.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—BASEBALL

Ms. Hickey: We are going to move right along to playing and practice season proposals. I am going to start off with the grouping of Proposals 2005-91-A, -B and -C. Those begin on Page 134 of your Official Notice.

These proposals deal with the baseball playing and practice season. The intent of this proposal is to amend the baseball playing and practice season as follows: (a) to limit the non-championship segment to 45 days during the months of September, October and November; (b) to establish February 1 as the first permissible practice date in the championships segment; (c) to establish the last Friday in February as the first permissible contest date in the championships segment; and (d) to reduce the maximum number of contests from 56 to 52.

Proposal 91-B is essentially identical to 91-A, except that it proposes a different competition start date. Proposal 91-B would establish the Friday in February that is 13 weeks before the Sunday immediately preceding Memorial Day as the first permissible contest date in the championship segment. I think that the 13-week period has to do with keeping the playing season the same length that it would be in 91-A, but it bases it off of the selection for the baseball championship.

Proposal 91-C is different from the other two by the first date of practice and the first date of competition. The first date of practice for 91-C would be the third Thursday in January, and the first competition date in 91-C would be the second Thursday in February. So the third Thursday in January for practice, the second Thursday in February for competition.

As you can see, the difference between 91-A, -B and -C is really just the practice date in two of them, and the competition date among the three of them. Certainly, these three proposals provide consistency with starting dates for both practice and competition.

With 91-B, the way that the season would be aligned would allow the membership to avoid the need to move the championship in baseball further into the summer in those seasons where there would be only 12 weeks in accordance with what 91-A is proposing, and with 91-A and -C, the start dates are very specific. With 91-B, it is a little bit of a moving target and would certainly require the staff to do a little bit of counting on our behalf in order to figure out when to start playing baseball.

Our LRS recommendation was to defeat 91-A and send 91-B and 91-C out for comment. Our reasoning is related to that 13-week issue, and being able to have the full 13 weeks during the baseball season given the number of contests that those teams play.

Chris Dawson (Pacific-10 Conference): I am an assistant commissioner and chair of the Championships/Competition Cabinet. This proposal came to us from the Baseball Issues Committee.

I think most of you are well aware of the reasons that the committee was established. It has wide representation from across the country. The members felt it was a good compromise in the best interest of baseball. The original proposal did not have the reduction in the number of games, but it did establish start dates for practice and competition, and it fixed the length of the season at 13 weeks.

After discussion, the cabinet elected to add the reduction in games from 56 to 52 because it felt with the season compacted, student-athletes in baseball would miss too much class time because even with 52 games and a 13-week season, the student-athletes would be playing four games per week on the average.

The Cabinet felt that the addition of the reduction of games was an important element if the 13-week season was approved. On behalf of the cabinet, I would urge you to approve 2005-91.

Now, I'm putting on my Pac-10 hat for a minute. The Pac-10 is where Proposal 2001-91-B originated. Our goal, as Kate mentioned, was to keep the time frame for the championships the same. The only way to do that is to count back 13 weeks from the typical selection date rather than moving the championships later. On behalf of the conference, I would urge you to vote for 91-B. That keeps intact the original intent of the Championships/Competition Cabinet and the Baseball Issues Committee. Thank you.

Larry Templeton (NCAA Baseball Committee): I am chair of the NCAA Baseball Committee and a member of the NCAA Baseball Issues Committee. This proposal did not have the cut of games in it originally. The baseball community spent a lot of time on this proposal and compromising. We are in support of the playing seasons. We are going to ask that the number of games be voted separately.

Jack Evans (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I am a faculty rep and a member of the Management Council. I'm also on the Committee on Academic Performance.

As we have noted in the discussion to this point, this package of proposals really addresses two different issues. One is the regulation of the playing and practice season. The other is the number of games in the competition season. One of the arguments that I have heard in the discussion of these proposals is that the reduction in the number of games will benefit the relatively low APRs that are observed in baseball. Some of you may know that last summer, as part of the work of the Committee on Academic Performance, an ad hoc baseball group was formed to gather data that would help us understand better some of the issues related to academic performance in the sport of baseball. The overwhelming message coming out of that data was that the two major effects on the APR are the unusual draft situation in baseball as well as the prolific use of the one-time transfer exception, which appears to contribute to a high volume of transfers

Proposition 2005-111, that we have already discussed, addresses that one-time transfer issue. So let me speak for a moment to the common feature of these three proposals, which suggests a reduction in games from 56 to 52. First of all, my reaction to that is if we are interested in reducing the number of games to give them more time to study, a reduction of four games is a rather modest reduction, if that is our major issue. The other observation I would make is we didn't get to this proposal to reduce the number of games by four by a comprehensive review of playing seasons in a number of sports, and then single out baseball as the one to be reduced. We, as you have just heard, got to that particular aspect of this proposal by consideration of a number of issues, and this was what might be called a late-added starter to these proposals.

I would urge careful consideration of the combination of issues that are reflected in these proposals. It strikes me that division of the proposals is a good way to permit a more ordered consideration of them. Thank you.

Greg Sankey (Southeastern Athletic Conference): I am an associate commissioner with the Southeastern Conference. I want to go back to 2005-91. The first paragraph deals with the structure of the fall season.

When the Baseball Issues Committee was first formed, the Southeastern Conference provided some correspondence on a number of issues. One piece of that correspondence was a more flexible structure for the fall practice opportunity. Essentially, we wanted to take the mentality of the spring football structure, if you will, which allows some flexibility—where you might practice two, three days a week, but you are not charged with five or six or seven days within that week in your playing season—and apply that model to fall baseball.

I think the Baseball Issues Committee, in visiting with members, accepted that and thought that was a reasonable idea. Keep in mind we are talking about a uniform start date to the traditional playing season. The opportunity to greatly expand and adjust and modify and play a lot of games with the structure of your fall goes away, because you have got a specific number of days that would typically be used. Our feeling was that fall flexibility would aid our coaches and our student-athletes. It is just a recognition that we are all outdoors, where it might rain or things might change after you set your playing and practice season.

In tracking the history, something got lost in the translation through no fault of anyone; but just in discussions, I think the way the proposal was written would lead one to conclude that actually this flexibility exists. In discussions we have learned that it hasn't. My intent is to inform the membership that at the Management Council meeting we will offer a motion to essentially restore flexibility that we think was originally intended to occur within this part of the proposal.

We ask for your support. Conceptually, we are talking about the flexibility that exists in spring football. We don't have to practice on consecutive days. You simply count the days on which you actually practice, using that within the window that is described now in Paragraph A, and applying that to future fall baseball practice opportunities.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—GENERAL PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS— REQUIRED DAY OFF—BASKETBALL EXCEPTION

Ms. Hickey: We will move on to 2005-125 if there are no further comments on the 91 proposals. Proposal 2005-125 is in relation to the general practice season regulations required day off basketball exception.

The intent of this proposal is to provide an exception to the required day off when the institution participates in three contests in a given week, provided the student-athletes do not engage in any countable athletically related activities for two days during either the preceding week or the following week.

This proposal provides some flexibility in relation to required days off when you have three or more contests in a particular week. Scheduling contests make it difficult to be adequately prepared. If you have three contests in a week, this would provide the flexibility to allow schools to better prepare for those contests. It is a basketball-only proposal that certainly can be a concern. Does this lead to these types of requests in other sports, such as baseball or softball?

One of the most important points to consider is the impact on the student-athlete's well-being. The LRS recommended that this proposal be put out for comment. I'll open up the floor now to anybody who has any comments, questions or other statements.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—OUT OF SEASON ACTIVITIES—HOURS OF SKILL INSTRUCTION, NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS—SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL

Ms. Hickey: The next topic for discussion is the skill instruction grouping of proposals. There are about 13 or 14 proposals, possibly even more than that, in the playing and practice season area that deal with the issue of out-of-season countable athletically related activities and specifically the issue of skill instruction.

I think there are really four primary issues that run through all of these proposals. Some of the proposals only relate to basketball. Some of them only deal with one or two of these particular issues. Some of the proposals relate to all sports. There is one proposal that specifically relates to football.

The first of the four primary issues in the proposals that are for sports other than football is how many of the eight hours should be limited to skill instruction? Should it be two? Should it be four? Should women's basketball be left at four, or should they be brought back to two?

The second issue is how many student-athletes should be present in skill instruction? Should it remain at four as it is now, or should it be opened up to having an unlimited number of student-athletes in a skill-instruction session?

The third issue is should the countable athletically related activities be prohibited one week prior to exams through the end of that student-athlete's final exam period?

The fourth issue that you will see is an issue that I suppose tries to mitigate the impact of an unlimited number of student-athletes on the quarter schools' and the semester schools' ability to have an unlimited number of student-athletes involved in skill instruction so much earlier in the year than the quarter schools due to the start of the academic calendars.

You will see in some of these proposals a period of time—September 15 through April 15—that would allow schools to have an unlimited number of student-athletes participate in skill instruction. Before that September date, during the academic year and after that April 15 date during the academic year, schools would only be allowed to have four student-athletes in skill instruction as it is now.

So those are the four main concepts that you will see addressed in these proposals. When we reviewed these proposals in our November meeting, we came to a few conclusions. Let me try to quickly run through those with you.

Essentially, we boiled it down to support in some way, shape or form for Proposals 131-B and 131-C. These proposals, if amended, will address each of those four issues. We recommended as a group to leave the number of hours at two. By supporting B and C, we wanted to put it out to the membership to decide the women's basketball issue—whether they stay at four or whether they come back to two. Putting those two proposals out will allow us to do that.

As a group, we don't support the September 15 through April 15 time period. We think that creates a more level playing field for those quarter schools that perhaps have a three- to four-week disadvantage to the semester schools that have their student-athletes involved in much more skill instruction.

In relation to the number of student-athletes involved in the skill instruction, we did believe that an unlimited number would be an appropriate change, and we do recommend that. We also recommended the prohibition on countable athletically related activity one week before exams through each student-athlete's final exam period. I hope that is clear as mud. I now will open that up for any comments, questions or statements.

Beth Bass (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): As it relates to 131, the WBCA supports an amendment to address the concerns of quarter schools with specific time frames and for number of athletes. Proposal 131-C maintains the current four hours of skill instruction for women's basketball that was adopted last year in the recruiting and access package.

Speaking of the recruiting and access package, I'd like to share some relevant points. Last year, the WBCA was granted a rare opportunity by President Brand to propose legislation that we felt was best for the sport. Through an enormous amount of time and investment by the WBCA and a collective group of stakeholders of our sport, we passed landmark legislation that has never been duplicated in the WBCA's 25-year history. I would like to request that before any changes to this original package are made, the NCAA membership would allow a full legislative cycle to thoroughly evaluate, research and survey its effectiveness.

If you don't mind, Kate, I am going to go ahead and move into 145 and 163, specifically, since I am already up here. Do you want me to wait?

Ms. Hickey: Let's hold off on that one. We will get there.

Ms. Bass: Okay. Thank you.

Charles Davis (Creighton University): Good morning. I run cross country for Creighton University, and I represent the student-athletes of the Missouri Valley Conference.

Corey Stevens (University of Illinois at Chicago): Good morning. My name is Corey Stevens. I am a women's tennis player at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and I represent the student-athletes of the Horizon Conference. On behalf of the Division I SAAC, we support two out of the three concepts concerning the playing and practice season. We have gathered strong input from our conference student-athletes to support prohibiting countable athletic-related activities one week before the final examination period. We believe that this is a crucial time that will allow the student-athletes to focus primarily on academics.

Secondly, the Division I SAAC supports to have an unlimited number of student-athletes as opposed to the restriction of four. Because this is permissive legislation, it will allow more efficient use of the student-athlete's time and will create an increased opportunity to develop more as a team.

Charles Davis (Creighton University): Given that we support efforts to keep the time demands of out-of-season student-athletes in check, we must oppose an increase from two to four skill instruction hours. We feel consistency between all sports, including football, is very important and that any more than two hours of skill instruction would increase pressures on voluntary practice, and that outside of that, that would be outside of the eight allowable hours currently.

We believe that Proposals 131-B and 129 capture the SAAC's position on all three concepts, and we urge you to support this legislation. Thank you.

Ms. Hickey: Thank you. Is there any further comment? I have one point to clarify on the one week before exams and then up until the prohibition on activities. It's one week prior to the exams up to the end of the stu-

dent-athlete's exam only during the off season. It is only outside the playing season when eight hours are allowed and certainly not during the primary practice season. So that is just a point of clarification.

We are going to move into recruiting. Helen is going to walk us through that area.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—COMPETITION AGAINST PROSPECTS

Ms. Grant: The first is 2005-72. It is on Page 205 of your Notice.

The intent is in all sports, to prohibit an institution's varsity team from competing against an established outside team that includes high-school prospects, except for permissible foreign tour competition, exempted contests against a foreign team in the United States, and the United States national team.

The subcommittee felt that this proposal would do one good thing—treat all sports consistently regarding competition against prospects. However, it had a concern about how this proposal would apply to open events. The subcommittee did suggest that this proposal be sent out to the membership for comment.

RECRUITING—CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS—SPORTS OTHER THAN BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL

Ms. Grant: The next proposal is 2005-75, which can be found on Page 210 of the Notice.

The intent is in sports other than basketball and football, to specify that in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians before July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; further, to eliminate the telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete during his junior year in high school.

The subcommittee noted that this proposal would reinstate the first contact and telephone call to after the prospect's junior year. The rule was originally changed in basketball and has since reverted back to the previous rule as outlined in this proposal. The subcommittee recognized that there has been support for this proposal expressed by several sports and coaches associations and noted that there are concerns that the current rule disrupts time of currently enrolled student-athletes at the institution. There is a concern about if the current rule achieved its intended result, which is early access to facilitate more sound recruiting decisions and minimized outside influences. The subcommittee wanted to forward this to the Board for possible adoption.

Please note that in your orange Convention Program there is a wording change to this; or I think it was actually something that should have been italicized but was not. If you look in the first part of the Convention Program, you will see the change to 2005-75.

Robert Boettner (College Swimming Coaches Association of America): I am the executive director of the College Swimming Coaches Association. We did extensive surveys, had discussions at our convention and discussions at our national championships. Our association is overwhelmingly in support of this proposal.

RECRUITING—CONTACTS SUBSEQUENT TO NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT SIGNING— MEN'S BASKETBALL

Ms. Grant: The next proposal is 2005-92 on Page 214 of your Official Notice.

The proposal's intent is to specify in men's basketball that once a prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent (or written offer of financial aid or admission for those institutions not subscribing to the National Letter of Intent) an institution may contact a high school academic official on the prospect's high school campus an unlimited number of times outside a contact period (except during a dead period) for the purpose of discussing matters specifically related to the prospect's initial eligibility.

The subcommittee was somewhat concerned that if more contact with the high school was a positive thing or if it was even necessary, and there were concerns about how to monitor that the contact was actually limited to academic matters. There was also a concern about other prospects at the high school.

Should the institution be charged with an evaluation for other prospects being recruited at that high school? The subcommittee did note that although the proposal specifies that the visit does not count as an evaluation for all prospects at the high school, there is a potential interpretive issue as to whether the visit to the high school should count in the 130-person days. The subcommittee did suggest that this proposal be forwarded to the membership for comment.

Shane Lyons (Atlantic Coast Conference): I am a member of the AEC (Academics/Eligibility/Compliance) Cabinet and chair of the recruiting subcommittee. We discussed Proposal 2005-92 in depth, and we believe that the intent of the proposal may be accomplished in other ways rather than having coaches in the high school outside of the contact period and outside of the evaluation period.

We feel that correspondence, e-mail and telephone calls from the coaches to the academic officials of the high schools can accomplish the academic achievement of advising those individuals of the academic credentials of those prospects, and we do not feel that those individuals should be on campus outside of the contact and evaluation periods. We ask you not to support 2005-92.

RECRUITING—RECRUITING-PERSON DAYS—WOMEN’S BASKETBALL

Ms. Grant: We actually have two proposals that are related to recruiting-person days in women’s basketball. Proposal 2005-145 on Page 218 and 2005-163 on Page 245, respectively, of your Official Notice.

Proposal 145 would revise the number of recruiting-person days from 85 to 130. The subcommittee noted that the current rule does not provide an adequate number of recruiting-person days for the coaches. This proposal will provide the same number of recruiting-person days as we have in men’s basketball currently, and certainly provides more flexibility in recruiting. However, the proposal would increase pressure and time on coaches and prospects, which was one concern.

Proposal 163 would increase the number of recruiting-person days from 85 to 105. The subcommittee noted that the current rule does not provide an adequate number of recruiting days, and it also provides the flexibility with the increased number of days to provide the opportunity for better evaluations and recruiting decisions. However, the subcommittee also noted that the additional time would increase the time coaches would spend away from campus and currently enrolled student-athletes and may affect the coach’s well-being. The subcommittee voted to forward both 145 and 163 to the membership for comment.

Beth Bass (Women’s Basketball Coaches Association): We appreciate you following up with sending it out for comment. The 85 recruiting days was one of the bedrock proposals of the original recruiting and access package. We are only halfway in tracking the use of days spent on their campuses with their current student-athletes and their own coaching staffs, as you noted. Earlier initial feedback has been positive, but it obviously is incomplete at this time. At this juncture, to alter the 85 days to 105 or 130, as in the case of men’s basketball, is inappropriate due to their different recruiting model and calendar.

Immediately after our season, we will begin to survey every Division I program and draw conclusions of whether to increase the number of recruiting days. At that time, if necessary, we will go to the proper channels of the Women’s Basketball Issues Committee to introduce those changes into the legislative cycle. To begin to tinker with the recruiting access package at this time would not only be premature, but it would slowly dismantle all of the positive strides we have made. We respectfully ask for sufficient time to properly evaluate its success. Thank you.

Greg Sankey (Southeastern Conference): The Southeastern Conference sponsored 2005-145, because our coaches asked us to. Very early in last year’s legislative process, our coaches looked at the whole package of proposals being advanced by the WBCA. They expressed concern to us very early in that process that they felt their number of recruiting days were being reduced, and reduced in a way that would impact in a negative fashion their opportunity to be on the road and recruit student-athletes.

I would share or echo the Legislative Review Subcommittee’s suggestion that this be advanced from this meeting into April, go out for comment and come back for second consideration. The reason is that when people sit down to plan out their recruiting years, it became apparent that there had been an impact on the opportunity to be on the road.

We don’t have to wait another year if we feel there is a need to correct this. We will be through the recruiting cycle, in essence, by the Management Council meeting in April. We can then consider in conversation with our coaches, many of whom may meet at the conclusion of the season, whether it is an appropriate adjustment to make.

I encourage the membership and the representatives of the Management Council to allow additional consideration. Both proposals actually would be fine with us if they go out for additional consideration because we can

deal with the issue right after the season and not have to wait until the end of the year if we feel it is necessary to make the adjustment. Thank you.

RECRUITING—TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS—SAFETY EXCEPTION—SUMMER PRIOR TO INITIAL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT AT THE CERTIFYING INSTITUTION

Ms. Grant: The next proposal is 2005-161—tryout exceptions, safety exception, summer prior to initial full-time enrollment at the certifying institution. This can be found on Page 242 of the Notice.

The intent is to permit a prospective student-athlete who is attending summer school before initial full-time enrollment to engage in activities permitted under the safety exception in the applicable sports.

The subcommittee noted that prospects were on campus anyway for summer school and will continue to work out, so there probably should be a qualified person overseeing those workout activities. There was concern that the proposal is limited to only those sports that have the safety exception available for student-athletes and also a concern that there will be an increase in pressuring prospects to work out due to the safety exception and presence of a coach. The subcommittee voted to forward this to the membership for comment.

RECRUITING—SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS—EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTS

Ms. Grant: We are going to look at 2005-164 on Page 247. The proposal addresses recruiting, sports camps and clinics, and employment of prospects.

The proposal's intent is to permit an institution in sports other than football to employ a prospect in its summer camp or clinic, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, has graduated from high school and is enrolled in the institution's summer term before initial full-time enrollment.

The subcommittee noted the proposal was not limited to only individuals receiving institutional athletics-related financial aid and felt that this is a practical application. It also gives flexibility for coaches to complete their staffs for camps and clinics. It increases the opportunity for the prospect in getting to know the coaches and the other athletes who will be on the team. However, the subcommittee noted concerns in that it may encourage the involvement in countable athletics-related activities and that it could deter from the academic focus while taking summer school classes. The subcommittee voted to forward both of these proposals out to the membership for comment.

Mitzi Clayton (University of Missouri, Columbia): As sponsors of this legislation, we find it is important to note that this is permissive legislation and one that in actuality was passed over a year ago with Proposal No. 2003-83, which provided greater latitude once the individual signed a National Letter of Intent with the institution, for the institution to, in essence and for all intents and purposes to consider them student-athletes.

Selfishly speaking as a compliance officer, I am pleased to see a piece of legislation that would strengthen the institution's opportunity to better monitor incoming student-athletes who have come to the community before their initial full-time enrollment. If an institution is, as it already should be, monitoring camps and clinics by way of knowing who is working, the types of activities they are performing for the camp and the amount of compensation they are receiving, it is a great opportunity for us to better monitor those individuals rather than what is currently permissible for them to work for boosters. That presents a far greater task to go off and do some on-site evaluations and communications with those employers to verify the legitimacy of those earnings.

To address some of the issues that have been raised, as far as encouraging involvement in countable athletically related activities, it is thought that there is no greater encouragement than already exists with student-athletes who are working in these camps. Obviously, that is an impermissible function that could not occur at the camp. Also, will this deter from academic focus while taking summer school? It is thought that it will indeed not. For the most part, these student-athletes have come to the community and they are not yet eligible. They have little to no family financial background or family financial contribution in many cases, and this provides them an opportunity to help have money for certain expenses not covered by their athletics aid, such as gas or personal hygiene expenses.

Further, it gives coaches the flexibility to be able to hire them and staff their camp. It also provides flexibility for the student-athlete. What better person than the coach who is running the camp to grant some latitude to

the student-athletes should they have obligations such as an exam the next day or a paper for which they could relieve the student-athlete from his or her camp employment responsibilities?

Nancy Hamant (University of Cincinnati): I am a faculty representative, and I have been for 20 years. I remember when this legislation was passed that would allow students to come in for summer school before their first experience on campus. I remember our discussions saying we will soon be talking about the athletics activities of these students rather than the academic purpose for which we brought them in.

We are well into that. The students have no business doing anything other than coming in for the orientation and academic beginning that we expected them to have, and to think that we are now talking about them working in camps and actually saying that the coaches will have a better opportunity to be supervising them because of that is amazing. I would like to know how they are going to spend more time with the academic advisors, who should be working with them to determine what kind of programs they are going to have the next fall, when they have the real pressure of their athletic programs.

It is an interesting development that this is where we have come to on what was for some of us an important issue.

RECRUITING—LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS—SCHOLASTIC AND NON-SCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Ms. Grant: Last, but not least, the next two proposals are dealing with tryout-type events. They are Proposals 2005-151 and 2005-155. Proposal 151 can be found on Page 225 of the Notice and 155 is on Page 233 of the Notice.

The intent of Proposal No. 151 is to prohibit football coaches from evaluating at specified events at any time; and to prohibit an institution from hosting activities devoted to testing the agility, flexibility, speed and strength of prospective football student-athletes.

The subcommittee felt that the proposal attempted to place an emphasis on the scholastic environment and to minimize outside nonscholastic influences. It also addresses the competitive equity concerns when events are permitted to be conducted on a campus. The subcommittee also asked how this would apply to two-year colleges that may be hosting these events.

The subcommittee voted to forward this proposal out to the membership for comment.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—TRYOUT EVENTS—HOST INSTITUTION

Ms. Grant: The intent of Proposal No. 155 is to prohibit an institution from hosting or sponsoring a tryout camp, clinic, group workout or combined event at any location.

The subcommittee had a concern related to the definition of a tryout camp or clinic versus an instructional camp or clinic, and what the impact would be on tryouts being conducted by national governing bodies.

The subcommittee voted to forward this proposal out to the membership for comment.

Greg Sankey (Southeastern Conference): I want to speak because we are involved in sponsoring both of these proposals and I think the Big Ten partnered with us.

There may be some questions to answer, but one thing has become clear to us. In fact, on 151 there is an encroachment of third parties into the football recruiting process. There is a leveraging of these events that occurs and involves our coaches and our campuses. There are inherent recruiting issues that come from that. Right now, there are discussions happening around the country about who is hosting what, where and if it is on their campus. Then other schools feel they need to catch up and do the same thing and permit hosting at their campuses. We think these two proposals, in combination, make great progress in helping us to limit the involvement of outside parties and influencing prospective student-athletes' decisions on where they attend the university or college and compete as student-athletes.

The questions the committee asked I think are relevant. I can assure you as sponsors we would work diligently to make sure those are answered in a clear and timely manner, but we do think it is important that both pieces of legislation advance and are enacted. Thanks.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Hickey: Thank you, Greg. Are there any further comments on 151 and 155?

This is a very important announcement in relation to the next session, which starts at 11. If you are a voting delegate and have not picked up your voting unit, you should stop at the counter outside this room before the 11 a.m. session. The voting will begin at 11.

I would also open it up at this time if there are proposals that we have not covered that folks have questions on, I would entertain them at this time.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NUMBER OF CONTESTS AND DATES OF COMPETITION—MAXIMUM LIMITATIONS—FIELD HOCKEY, WOMEN'S LACROSSE, SOCCER, VOLLEYBALL

Kathy DeBoer (American Volleyball Coaches Association): I would like to call your attention to Proposal 2005-143 that is sponsored by the Big Ten Conference. It is on Page 189 of the Notice, and it speaks to the number of contests and dates of competition and the maximum limitations, and how they impact the traditional and the non-traditional seasons.

We represent 300 Division I women's volleyball teams. There really are not a lot of issues with this proposal as it relates to women's volleyball. We also represent about 35 men's Division I volleyball teams that are spread very widely geographically around the country. The way this proposal is written for volleyball generically, adversely impacts the men's programs because of the geographical disbursements.

I would simply ask folks who are in a conference where there is a men's volleyball program to look at the possibility of amending this legislation to make it women's-volleyball specific. In the second place, I would ask those representing an institution to look at the impact of this on the volleyball program in Hawaii simply again because of the geographical impact.

We think this is good legislation and would support it, but we would ask for your consideration of a couple of amendments—one for the men's volleyball and the second one for Hawaii. Thank you.

Pat Britz (National Soccer Coaches Association of America): Following up on 2005-143, if I could get a point of clarification. In the spring for soccer, it is five dates of competition, wherein the fall it is contest. How would that impact if you did miss class during the spring to go compete in an event and you participated, for example, in three contests over two dates of competition. How would that count back toward that fall season?

In addition, if you did compete in 20 contests during the fall, and then you did do this in the spring where it would count back, are you automatically charged with a violation and thus have to reduce your number of contests for the following fall season?

Lynn Holzman (NCAA Staff): In relation to the first question, that is a question that the sponsors would have to ask. If they feel it is appropriate, they can certainly go to the microphone now. In relation to the second question, that is a question that has been asked of the proposal already and your conclusion is correct. It would result in a violation.

Mr. Britz: Thank you. Following up on that, on behalf of the NSCAA, we oppose this proposal. In light of the fact there are several Division I soccer institutions that are in rural areas and must travel maybe once during the spring to participate in contests, and also in light of Proposal 2005-72, which would eliminate the possibility of playing established club teams on their own campus, which eliminates missed class time. So, thank you.

Ms. Hickey: Thank you, Pat. I think we have some clarification from Microphone No. 1.

Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference): I want to make the general comment that the Big Ten Conference is in support of this proposal. It actually goes back to when the membership was considering the total elimination of the spring legislative contests under 2004-40.

Under those comments for those coaches groups and others who protested that elimination, it was generally said that no class time was being missed, therefore, there should be no reason why this should happen. So in some ways, I think the conference is simply codifying an area that almost 100-something comments came back that we are not missing class time, so why are you taking this away from us? That is the first point I want to make.

One of the greatest fears, of course, is when you codify current practice, now it seems like people have questioned the fact they are missing class time. With regard to five days of competition versus five contests, Steve Mallonee may want to help me with this, because we did go back and forth on this a little bit. It was the sense that if you were being charged, it would be back to the fall, not to the spring just in terms of how it is being written. At least that is in terms of the interpretive issues. That is my discussion with the NCAA staff.

Ms. Grant: Thank you, Carol.

Pat, do you have anything further?

Mr. Britz: Not on that one. On behalf of the NSCAA, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 2005-140. This would increase the number of preseason practice opportunities from 21 to 29 for both men's and women's soccer.

This increase in practice opportunities would serve two purposes. Number one, it will assist soccer student-athletes to better prepare for a demanding season in which teams generally play 20 games over an 11-week period.

Secondly, it will make soccer consistent with volleyball, which currently has 29 practice opportunities.

Further, in response to the Championship/Competition Cabinet's concern that this would increase the time demands placed on soccer student-athletes before the start of the academic year, the NSCAA respectfully disagrees with this concern inasmuch as the three and in rare occasions four additional days of practice would be included in the overall 132-day season. Therefore, no additional time demands would be incurred.

Finally, the NSCAA concurs there would be increased cost for some institutions. However, it could be argued that these costs could be outweighed by the fact student-athletes would be better acclimated to the physical demands of the championship season. Thank you.

Ms. Hickey: Thanks, Pat. We have time for one more comment or question, and then we are going to have to wrap it up.

Gerald Lage (Oklahoma State University): I would like to comment on Proposal 97 for the academic performance program proposal on Page 7 and the reason for introducing the proposal.

The proposal basically says that if a student-athlete has already graduated or completed all graduation requirements and has eligibility remaining, then at that point it might legitimately be that they could not be taken out of the cohort any future semester if they have eligibility remaining.

The request really came from our registrar people as well as the academic advisors who were doing the work of calculating these things. They asked why are we doing this for a student who has already graduated? Indeed, we can think back to the performance program, and the incentives and disincentives program has basically come down to a program that has as its primary goal graduation and its primary ties for the worst performing teams.

So when it gets down to looking at the semester-by-semester performance, we say if a student has already graduated, his or her performance and future semesters obviously can't be a predictor when he or she accomplished attainment of a bachelor's degree, which is a goal of the system.

To save that performance from the student who has already graduated is highly unlikely to help the team score and simply says we are interfering with the integrity of the system to accurately and honestly predict the goal we wish to achieve.

We also have heard that student-athletes who have graduated who are performing ought to be held accountable for some real time value added. I propose that this instrument is not the way to do that. If you want real time value added, you have got to have weekly or monthly checks or something, and certainly not an APR point.

So we think that the system ought to probably go back and say these students have achieved their objective, we salute them for going ahead and meeting the objectives at this point to take the graduate program or certification program, or some additional courses they simply didn't need while performing.

We think most of them are going to be responsible and do that. We probably don't need this system to try to add that objective to what it was originally intended for. Thank you.

Ms. Hickey: I thank you. Thank you for your time and your attention today. We are going to take a quick break of 15 minutes. We will begin again promptly at 11 o'clock for the override vote.

[The Division I Legislative Review Forum was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.]

DIVISION I BUSINESS SESSION

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 2006

The Division I business session was called to order at 11 a.m. by Philip Austin, University of Connecticut.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Austin: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for being with us this morning. I would like to begin with a few housekeeping preliminaries before I call the 2006 Division I business session to order.

I am Phil Austin, president of the University of Connecticut, and I am serving this year as chair of the Division I Board of Directors. We also have on the platform with us Ron Wellman, director of athletics at Wake Forest, and chair of the Division I Management Council; and Kate Hickey, associate director of athletics at Rutgers, and vice chair of the Management Council. In addition, we have our president, Myles Brand, and David Berst, Beth DeBauche and Steve Mallonee from the NCAA staff.

Number two, because the issues on which we will be voting today are held as extremely important by many of us, and not all feel the same way, the senior staff and I have thought it might be important and useful to spend just a couple of minutes to review technology and the process for determining the voting process today.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

I would also like to outline the process we will use to consider Proposal 2004-21, which can be found on Pages 1 to 3 of the 2005 Division I Official Notice, and with the agendas at your seats. To begin, I will identify a speaker at one of the numbered microphones who will introduce the basic motion to override the Board of Directors' action to adopt Proposal 2004-21. I am advised that a delegate is prepared to make that motion when called upon, and I will then ask for a second. Please note that based on several requests, we already have divided the proposals to consider each woman's sport individually: Paragraph A for gymnastics; Paragraph B for volleyball; Paragraph C for cross country/track and field; and Paragraph D for soccer. Dividing a proposal may be done at the request of any voting delegate and does not require a motion. In addition, all voting members are eligible if you desire to vote on each paragraph. Football is the only sport where the institution or conference must sponsor the sport in order to cast the vote.

I will first open the discussion on the motion to override the Board of Directors' April 2005 action to increase the head count in women's gymnastics from 12 to 14, and will acknowledge those stationed near a microphone for this purpose. Once the chair is satisfied that the discussion has been concluded or that no new information concerning the matter at issue is being presented, I will announce that it is time to vote. Please remember that a "yes" vote will support the override of the Board and maintain the current aid limits. A "no" vote will support the Board of Directors' action to increase aid in the sport. Abstentions count in the determination of a quorum, but not in the determination of a majority vote. A successful override of the Board of Directors, therefore, requires a five-eighths majority of "yes" votes over the total "yes" and "no" votes cast on the motion. We then will follow the same process to continue Paragraphs B, C and D, respectively. I hope this information is helpful in conducting an orderly business session. I will pause before we begin in the event there are questions. If you intend to participate in discussion of the initial motion in the sport of gymnastics, I invite you to take up a station near a microphone.

OVERRIDE VOTE

I would now like to call the 2006 Division I business session to order. As you know, we are here for the purpose of considering an override of the Board of Directors' action to adopt Proposal 2004-21, which increases countable financial aid in four women's sports—gymnastics, volleyball, cross country/track and field, and soccer. Now, 116 overrides were properly submitted by Division I institutions within 60 days of Board action, which stayed the legislative change until resolution of the matter today. At its August 2005 meeting, the Board determined that a Convention voting session was the proper venue to reach final resolution concerning the apparent varying views of Division I members on this subject. I will now recognize Microphone No. 5.

FINANCIAL AID—MAXIMUM TEAM LIMITS—SELECTED WOMEN’S SPORTS

John Parry (Butler University): I would like to move to override the vote of the Board of Directors on Proposition 2004-21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Can we make general comments overall, or do you want to limit it to sport by sport? There are overall comments that can be made for you.

Mr. Austin: I will not repeat the advice that I have gotten verbatim here, but anything that you deem to be appropriate overall is fine as long as we don’t get started down a wrong path.

Mr. Parry: I appreciate that. It is exciting to be here, isn’t it?

We are back on the floor, one institution, one vote.

There are three specific concerns about the cost of all these proposals to increase scholarships. It varies, of course, whether you are a private institution or a public institution. I think there is more concern about the impact on competitive equity. We have seen in a number of sports that when there have been reductions, that it has been much more competitive across the country. It is logical to conclude that if we go up in the number of scholarships, a number of schools will, if you will, stockpile and, therefore, make a competitive imbalance.

I think the hard part for all of us is that this is about equity. It is about opportunity for women. I would be the last person to stand here not in favor of opportunity for women. But I will tell you the answer for those who are struggling for opportunity for women is to add more sports. Don’t just add scholarships in selected sports. Add sports. Add opportunities in a number of sports that currently are not sponsored for women on your campus. Thank you.

Carolyn Schlie Femovich (The Patriot League): I would like to follow up on John’s comments, perhaps more for the record, but just to be clear about some positioning here. A vote for the override should not be viewed as a vote against gender equity or opportunities for women athletes. I and many others simply believe that adding grants in these four women’s sports is not the best nor the most meaningful way to enhance the scholarship opportunities or the competitive opportunities for women athletes. I encourage you to support the override vote simply because we believe that there is a better way of going about doing this and that increasing meaningful competitive opportunities for women may occur as a result of more sports or other approaches. We do not believe that this is the best approach and in the best interest of our student-athletes. Thank you.

Dru Hancock (Big 12 Conference): I appreciate the comments of John and Carolyn. At its core, Proposal 21 is fundamentally about increased scholarships and participation opportunities for women. That was envisioned originally by Title IX.

Title IX has worked well in providing additional opportunities to this point. This legislation has provoked great national debate. I think it is a great thing, and it is a great thing to be here—one vote, one institution—to discuss this. But the reality is that many Division I institutions can and do want to do better with providing opportunities contemplated by Title IX, but they are not going to add additional sports to do that. By adding scholarships, we can at least help fulfill those goals. Current scholarship levels in the four sports identified for increase were mandated 20 years ago. The landscape has changed significantly since that time. Major growth has occurred at both the high school and college levels in those four sports.

In trying to evaluate from the Big 12 Conference perspective and the national perspective, we have the competing interest of competitive equity on the one hand and providing enhanced opportunities on the other. We hope that you will decide for the interests of continued positive growth in grants for women.

Title IX has worked well so far. It is our hope that the NCAA membership will vote to allow this progress to continue against the override and for additional scholarships for women student-athletes. Thank you.

Jeff Orleans (The Ivy Group): It is hard to disagree with the call to add opportunities for women athletes, but if the real issue that the Pac-10 and other supporters of this legislation want to promote is an overall review of an NCAA approach that has not been looked at for 20 years, that’s what we should do.

I think everyone in this room would be glad to look at how we can comprehensively address greater equity for women athletes. That is not what these proposals do. These proposals ask us to add scholarships in a very

selective group of sports to assist a very selective group of institutions when the vast majority of institutions and conferences in this room believe there is a better way to provide equity for women across the country, and those schools and conferences urge you to support the override in each of these four sports. Thank you.

Mike Alden (University of Missouri, Columbia): I am here to speak on defeat of the override with three points.

First, I think the opinion that additional scholarships create a competitive imbalance, I don't believe there is solid data that would support that. Number two, with regard to solid data that do support increasing scholarships for women athletes provides greater access and greater opportunity for women throughout our country, we think that is a good thing. Number three is that as an athletics director and knowing that all of us struggle each and every day with trying to generate additional resources for our programs, I can think of no easier way when you are out raising money to be able to get people to be able to support what they are doing in higher education than for scholarships for women athletes.

Therefore, considering those three points, I would suggest very strongly and urge you to defeat this override. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 2004-21-A was adopted, 188-111-23.]

Mr. Austin: There is an additional Paragraph B, which is a motion to override the Board's action to increase the maximum limit of counters in women's volleyball from 12 to 13. Is there any discussion? There is no discussion. It appears that we are ready for the vote, and the polls are open.

[Proposal No. 2004-21-B was adopted, 204-117-0.]

Mr. Austin: Is there any discussion of Paragraph C, which is a motion to override the Board's action to increase the maximum limit of counters in women's cross country and track and field from 18 to 20? There is no discussion. The polls are open.

[Proposal No. 2004-21-C was adopted, 202-117-0.]

Mr. Austin: Finally, is there discussion of Paragraph D, which is a motion to override the action of the Board to increase the maximum limit of counters in women's soccer from 12 to 14?

Pat Britz (National Soccer Coaches Association of America): On behalf of the NSCAA, I am speaking in opposition to the override of Proposal 2004-21 from a women's soccer standpoint only. There are several reasons why adopting this proposal is the right thing to do for women's soccer. However, for the sake of brevity, I will only focus on a few.

The most obvious reason for adopting the proposal would be to provide more opportunities for young women to participate in Division I intercollegiate soccer while on scholarship. The last time the maximum financial aid limitation for soccer increased was in 1996-97, when it went from 11 to 12. From 1998 to 2002, 188 Division I institutions added women's soccer and currently there are over 300 Division I programs. I believe the only women's sport with more sponsoring institutions at the Division I level may be basketball. Further, the next highest sponsorship increase during that same time was golf with 96. From 1995 to 1996 until 2001-02, the number of participants in women's soccer increased by 58 percent from 4,423 to 6,976. This is more than any other women's sport during that same time. From 1996-97, the same year scholarships were increased from 11 to 12, to 2001-02, the number of women's soccer participants on scholarship increased an average of 3.8 per institution. This is more than any other women's sport with the exception of rowing.

These are the same facts and figures determined by the ad hoc group that was formed to review the women head count in equivalency sports, which ultimately led to this proposal. The NSCAA is fully aware of the increased cost institutions would have to absorb for adding two soccer scholarships. However, based on the previously stated figures, it is clear an increase in scholarship opportunities is warranted. The women's game has made tremendous strides in popularity and competitiveness over the past 10 years. The possibility of an institution being able to offer two additional scholarships will only continue rather than hinder that trend in the sport of women's soccer. I strongly encourage you to vote in opposition of the override of this proposal regarding women's soccer. Thank you.

Sandra Clubb (Arizona State University): I would like to mention two points. I regret that I don't have the injury statistics, but soccer has the highest injury rate of all women's athletics. From an institution that actually

had five women in our program suffer knee injuries this year, we do know that firsthand. Secondly, in the sport of basketball, there are 12 scholarships. We play 11 women on the field at a time. Being an equivalency sport, I strongly recommend that you vote “no” on the override.

[Proposal No. 2004-21-D was defeated, 192-125-1.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Austin: I thank you all for your cooperation in conducting this vote. Is there any other business? It was suggested to me earlier that it has been some time since there has been this type of a turnout in a Division I-A business meeting, and that perhaps the best contribution the Board can make would be to have a controversy each year, but not on my watch. I encourage you all to be here next year. The meeting is adjourned.

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.]

DIVISION II BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2006

The Division II business session was called to order at 8:03 a.m by Kathryn A. Martin, University of Minnesota Duluth.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Martin: Good morning. The 2006 Division II business session will come to order. I'm Kathryn Martin. I'm the chancellor of the University of Minnesota Duluth and chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

As we begin today's business session, I would like for the other Division II Management Council and Presidents Council officers to stand and be recognized as I introduce them: Presidents Council vice chair, Arthur Kirk, Saint Leo University; Management Council chair, Paul Engelmann, Central Missouri State University, representing the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; and Management Council vice chair, Jill Willson, athletics director, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, representing the Lone Star Conference.

I would like to take a few moments to remember one of our Division II Presidents Council members who passed away in November. Dr. Albert Sloan, president of Miles College, would have concluded more than a four-year term on the Presidents Council this month. Not only did he serve as a member of the Presidents Council, but he was active in the Division II project team that reviewed issues related to diversity. He was a member of the NCAA Executive Committee Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues. Additionally, he assisted in planning several NCAA Conventions, including this Centennial celebration. His light will continue to burn brightly through all of those who knew him and respected him as a university president and as a champion for student-athletes. I can't remember one Presidents Council meeting where Al didn't speak out and say: "Well, you know, the student-athlete ..." We will miss him.

I would also like to take this opportunity to introduce other members joining me on the dais. Please welcome Larry Fitzgerald, Southern Connecticut State University, who will serve as our Division II parliamentarian. Members of the Division II governance staff are: Mike Racy, vice president for Division II; and Terri Steeb, director of Division II. I would also like to introduce Rich McGlynn, Stephanie Quigg, Phil Hunt and Jay Jones of the NCAA membership services staff who are here to help us with legislative questions and issues that may come up during the course of this business session. Thank you all for being here.

I have a series of brief announcements. Before we begin the voting process this morning, we need to take a few moments to review the voting process for the business session.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

At this time, I would like to introduce Art Kirk, who will present the Presidents Council report.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

Arthur Kirk (Saint Leo University): Thank you, Kathryn.

Good morning. My name is Arthur Kirk. I'm president of Saint Leo University and vice chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

We have decided to take a different approach regarding Convention reports. In an effort to be more efficient with your time, we again this year produced a written version of the Management Council, Presidents Council and budget reports. Each of you should have received a copy of the Division II Convention yearbook. This year's Convention yearbook contains important committee reports and information for Division II. This yearbook assists us in conducting our business session more efficiently and provides you with detailed written reports to take back to your campuses. I encourage you to share the yearbook with staff not in attendance at this year's Convention.

I would like to take a few minutes to highlight some of the information that is included in the 2005 yearbook. On Pages 9 and 10 you will find an updated summary of Division II facts and figures. Pages 11 through 13 pro-

vide a quick overview of the benefits of being a Division II member and some quick facts that you may or may not have known about the division. These three documents provide a snapshot and profile of Division II membership. For a more in-depth analysis of the Division II membership, I encourage you to read the 2004-05 Division II membership report that was mailed to your institutions this summer.

The Division II newsmakers section on Pages 15 through 30 highlights some of the accomplishments of Division II student-athletes and administrators in 2005. We all should be proud to have these individuals as part of our Division II family.

The Division II strategic plan accomplishments in 2005 can be found on Pages 50 through 53. This section summarizes the strategic achievements in Division II this past year. As a result of our strategic plan, the division conducted a presidents and chancellors summit this past June with over 140 CEOs in attendance and began planning for the second Division II championships festival to be held in Florida in the fall of this year. We conducted an inaugural FAR fellows institute in October; funded 21 assistant coaching positions in 12 different conferences, amounting to \$336,000; and distributed \$1 million to Habitat for Humanity for victims of Hurricane Katrina.

Last year, the Management Council and Presidents Council updated the goals and priorities outlined in the Division II strategic plan to align with those in the NCAA strategic plan. The Division II plan is presented on Pages 40 through 48 of the book.

Pages 55 through 84 in the yearbook relate to the 2005 Presidents Council, Management Council and committee reports of the Division II governance structure. These reports deliver important information regarding the initiatives undertaken by each group.

I encourage you to read all of the committee reports, and contact the committee chair or staff liaisons if you have any questions or concerns. Please also review the Division II budget information set forth on Pages 86 and 87 in the yearbook. Division II budget principles implemented the past few years have resulted in significant surpluses, and these unallocated dollars continue to fund championships, expansion and enhancements for Division II—without the Budget and Finance Committee looking to tap into enhancement funds or conference grants to pay for these new initiatives.

Pages 94 through 100 of the yearbook cover information regarding Division II championships and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Make-A-Wish initiative.

The final pages provide additional information on the chancellors and presidents summit that was held last summer. We conclude the book with the Division II philosophy statement. I hope that this yearbook continues to be a useful tool for all of you. Time has been set aside at the conclusion of our legislative business today for questions and comments you may have about this yearbook and the work of your Division II governance structure. That concludes the Presidents Council report for the 2006 Convention.

Ms. Martin: Thanks, Art.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Let me continue with some procedural issues. Roberts Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. The Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendixes in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you. NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently, and let me briefly review those. We will use the voting machines for roll-call votes. All other votes will be handled by paddles. Roll-call votes were designated by the Presidents Council for those proposals that appear important to create a historical record of each Division II school and how they voted on an issue. We will attempt to "eyeball"

as many paddle votes as possible and call for a machine count only when there is doubt as to whether or not there is a majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a machine vote unless the vote count seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be used to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to no single motion more than twice. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in Appendix K, which is in the back of your Official Notice and in the introduction. I will not repeat them here. Identify yourself by name and institution or affiliation whenever you address the Convention. That's very, very important. When you get to a microphone, begin your comments with your name and your institution or conference affiliation whenever you address this body.

The delegates wearing Convention badges with light blue, gray or green are permitted to speak. Those with any other colored ribbons are visitors and may not participate, other than as observers. As a reminder, the speeches made during today's business session for each proposal create a historical record that becomes important for research regarding the legislative intent of the 2006 voting delegates. The annual Convention Proceedings will serve as the official record of this business session, and your remarks will be included in those proceedings.

Let me review briefly the window of reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the consideration of the 40 Division II proposals, we will pause for a moment for people to organize for the period of reconsideration. I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on. All motions to reconsider must occur during this window of reconsideration.

Also, please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates for implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If an immediate effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will then be August 1, 2006. I repeat that. If an immediate effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will be August 1, 2006.

We have a court reporter here today to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I remind you again to identify yourself and your institution or affiliation when you speak.

Let me also call your attention to two Convention publications—first, the Convention Program, which you received at registration. You will find in the Program the schedule for today's Division II business session. The second publication I want to mention is the Official Notice. I think I've now held it up three times, but this is the Official Notice. On Pages 55 to 67, you will find a list of the 40 legislative proposals that you will consider during this Division II business session.

I would also like to call your attention to the procedural issues memo. This memo highlights procedural issues related to the legislative proposals.

We will attempt to follow the business session schedule. If we have not completed our voting this morning, we will recess around 12:30. However, we will take the liberty, if it looks as though we're within 15 to 20 minutes of proceeding through to the end of our business. If we go to lunch, we will give you the time to return to continue the business session.

Before we begin our official business, one action that we must dispense with first is approving the Convention Notice and the Convention Program. If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Convention Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in those publications. So if you wish to move to re-order a proposal, now is the time to approach the microphone.

I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, we are adopting the emergency legislation adopted by the Presidents Council as described in Appendix B, Pages 69 to 70; the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix C, Pages 71 to 76; the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix D, Pages 77 to 114; and the intent-based amendments in Appendix E, Page 115. These interpretations and amendments all have been

approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council during the past 12 months, and we will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

I will now ask someone for a motion to adopt the Official Notice and printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work. Is there a motion?

From the Floor: So moved.

From the Floor: Second.

Ms. Martin: It's been moved and seconded.

After this motion, we can now consider any motions to re-order proposals. Do I have such a motion? Seeing none and hearing none, we will proceed.

I will now call for a paddle vote on the main motion. All of those in favor of accepting the Official Notice and Program of this Convention, please signify by raising your paddle. The motion carries.

We are now ready to start our voting. This year, the Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals 1 through 16 as the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group. The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals Nos. 17 to 23 as those it believes are of particular interest to Division II chancellors and presidents, and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping this year. After considering the Presidents Council grouping, we will then consider the rest of the legislation, beginning with Proposal No. 24 and continuing until we finish with Proposal No. 40.

We are now ready to begin our consideration of legislative proposals. We will start on Page 2 of the Official Notice with the consent package, Proposals Nos. 1 through 16.

CONSENT PACKAGE

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposals Nos. 1 through 16 as the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

Each of these proposals was placed in the consent package because of the nature of the change being proposed. Each of these 16 proposals is considered without controversy or is editorial in nature; therefore, it is appropriate to vote on all 16 as a package.

[The consent package was adopted.]

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL—SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION—FAILURE TO COMPLETE

Ms. Martin: We are now ready to look at Proposals Nos. 17 to 23 that make up this year's presidents grouping. We are ready for Proposal No. 17. This is a roll-call vote with an immediate effective date. There will be two votes on this proposal. The immediate effective date will be considered first by paddle vote, and it needs a two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the merits of the proposal, followed by a roll-call vote on Proposal No. 17.

Herb Reinhard (Valdosta State University): On behalf of the Membership Committee, I move Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Membership Committee, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

This proposal makes it clear that the self-study report is a vital component of membership and was established to assist an institution with institutional control issues. Under this proposal, institutions will be placed on probation for one year for failure to complete the self-study report, and the institution will not be eligible to receive Division II enhancements fund.

The Membership Committee believes this penalty will ensure that every Division II institution is completing its self study within the five year requirement. Further, institutions who fail to complete their self study during the one year probationary period will be fined \$1,000 and placed in restricted membership status.

Currently, institutions may submit a waiver to the Membership Committee when circumstances prevent an institution from completing the self study within the five year requirement. With this waiver opportunity, if needed, institutions should be completing their self study no later than their institution's due date.

This proposal makes sense because it furthers the principle of institutional control. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Membership Committee and the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 17.

During the past two years, it was discovered that over 30 institutions failed to complete the institutional self-study guide within the legislated five-year period. The self-study guide is a vital component to Division II membership and should be taken seriously. Due to the large number of institutions that failed to complete the self study, the committee determined that a penalty structure needed to be in place to address this issue.

Under Proposal No. 17, institutions would be required to complete the institutional self-study guide within the legislated five-year period to maintain all benefits provided to active Division II members. The adoption of this proposal's penalty structure will emphasize the importance of completing the self study within the legislated time period, while furthering the principles of institutional control.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 17 was adopted, 247-4-1.]

ETHICAL CONDUCT—UNETHICAL CONDUCT

Ms. Martin: For Proposal No. 18, please refer to the procedural issues document that was distributed this morning and note that the effective starting date should read: "Immediate."

Carl McAloose (Florida Gulf Coast University): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Management Council, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Current legislation does not specify that the act of providing impermissible substances, such as prescription drugs, that impact student-athletes' performance is an institutional violation. This proposal clarifies that such an egregious act violates the Association's ethical conduct bylaws, since it is contrary to the health and safety of student-athletes.

Unfortunately, some institutional personnel have provided impermissible prescription drugs to student-athletes to enhance their performance. This act violates the general principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct, competitive equity, and most importantly, student-athlete well-being. Adopting this proposal clearly delineates that any individual who provides impermissible substances to student-athletes is in violation of the Association's own ethical conduct bylaws.

It is important to note that this proposal would not apply to student-athletes with documented medical history, demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Arthur Kirk Jr. (Saint Leo University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 18.

This proposal verifies that providing impermissible substances such as prescription drugs that impact athletics performance is unethical. There is nothing that is more important than protecting our student-athletes' health and well-being.

It is unfortunate that we have to regulate this type of activity, but it is becoming more common in our culture. Adding this provision may not completely end this practice, but it sends a message that is loud and clear

that this type of behavior will not be tolerated.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Joshua Rogers (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I am from the Great Lakes Valley Conference, and I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 18. Our primary concern is the well-being of the student-athlete, and this proposal protects us with respect to both health and eligibility. Furthermore, any staff member who jeopardizes student-athlete well-being by inappropriately providing student-athletes with the specified substances as outlined in the proposal, should be held accountable for their actions.

[Proposal No. 18 was adopted, 257-0-0.]

AMATEURISM—GENERAL REGULATION—VALIDITY OF AMTEUR STATUS —PROSPECTIVE OR TRANSFER STUDENT-ATHLETE

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal 19.

[The motion was seconded].

This proposal would require NCAA certification for the amateur status of any prospect initially enrolling at a Division II institution by creating an amateurism clearinghouse.

This clearinghouse will address the membership's concerns about the ability to properly certify the amateur status of prospective student-athletes. The clearinghouse will certify not only prospects entering our institutions out of high school, but also those from two- and four-year institutions who have never before competed within Divisions I or II. The clearinghouse will make amateurism certifications of both domestic and foreign students. From the student's perspective, it will be very similar to the current initial-eligibility clearinghouse.

The amateurism certification clearinghouse should enhance both recruiting and competitive equity in all Division II institutions. It is important to note that the amateurism clearinghouse will certify some aspects of amateurism—for instance, the season of competition rule—but not all. The institution will still be required to verify the amateur status of its student-athletes, particularly the amateur status of student-athletes' past enrollment.

On behalf of the Management Council, and with the excitement of finally realizing equity in the area of amateurism certification, I strongly encourage your support of Proposal 19. Thank you.

Antoine Garibaldi (Gannon University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 19.

The proposed amateurism clearinghouse would help to establish a more equitable playing field when recruiting student-athletes, because the clearinghouse will certify all incoming student-athletes' pre-enrollment amateur status at every Division II institution. Thus, the amateurism legislation will be applied consistently.

In addition, by maintaining one centralized clearinghouse, there will be more information available on the true amateur status of all student-athletes, and no institution will have an advantage based on its resources or contacts.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 19.

Marius Dan (South Atlantic Conference): I'm from the South Atlantic Conference, and I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 19. This clearinghouse promotes student-athlete well-being, as it establishes a consistent certification process for the Division II membership and the Association. Also, the clearinghouse will maintain competitive equity in recruiting and competition by preventing athletes who have lost their amateur status from competing with or against us. Finally, we realize that a large number of athletes will be processed through this clearinghouse, and we would like to stress that the timeliness of certification should be of the utmost importance to the committee to ensure that practice and competition are not missed.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 19 was adopted, 245-9-0.]

AMATEURISM—PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES—STUDENT-ATHLETES NAME, PICTURE OR LIKENESS

Roger Thomas (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded].

On behalf of the Management Council, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I rise to support Proposal No. 20. The current rule has historically been a rule that is difficult to understand, and most importantly, difficult to implement on campus.

Proposal No. 20 attempts to provide guidance on the type of permissible promotional activities a student-athlete may be involved with. Under the current rule, a student-athlete may participate in promotional activity if it is an institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit entity. This proposal does not change permissible entities. For example, it would still be permissible for student-athletes to be involved in a cancer awareness walk.

What this proposal clarifies is the types of identification a commercial entity could use as a co-sponsor for the promotion. For example, if McDonald's was to co-sponsor a cancer awareness walk and posters were created to get people to attend, the posters could only name the trademark of the commercial entity for McDonald's — the golden arches — on the poster. If this proposal is adopted, McDonald's could also use the slogan, "I'm loving it," and have a picture of a Big Mac. A little levity for this morning.

Under the current rule, the McDonald's slogan could take up the entire poster. While under this proposal, the McDonald's logo trademark and whatever else the charitable agency would want to put on the poster, is limited to 25 percent of the poster. This limitation helps to ensure that this is truly a promotion for a charitable event and not a commercial for McDonald's.

Lastly, the proposal would require that the co-sponsor must be identified as such. Meaning the poster would have to indicate that McDonald's is simply a co-sponsor of the cancer awareness walk, and it is not a poster promoting the commercial product.

This proposal would create more flexibility by permitting a commercial co-sponsor to place more than just its name, logo and trademark on a poster, and it limits the amount of content to 25 percent of the total promotion. Please remember this promotion still vests the institution with the authority to determine the type of promotional activities the student-athletes are involved in, along with ensuring that student-athletes are not being exploited.

It is critical to remember two things. First, the current rule was put in place to permit student-athletes to be involved with meaningful causes and allow them to do good things in our communities. Secondly, the fundamental principle of amateurism is that student-athletes cannot endorse a commercial product. This proposal does not change either of these two critical points.

This proposal simply provides more definitive guidelines in the type of promotional activities in which our student-athletes may be involved. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Robert C. Brown (Arkansas Tech University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I wish to speak in further support of Proposal No. 20.

Proposal No. 20 amends legislation that pertains to the student-athlete's involvement in promotional activities. As we all know, it is not permissible for a student-athlete to endorse a commercial product. This proposal does not change that conclusion.

This proposal was put forward because of the technological advances that have increased the opportunities for multimedia promotions. Current legislation has limited the institutions' potential to partner with commercial entities to advance initiatives such as educational mission and the values of the student-athlete experience.

This proposal would increase the institutions' flexibility to engage in various types of promotions, while maintaining the current restrictions on the types of entities—institutional, charitable, educational, nonprofit—that may use the name or likeness of the student-athlete.

This proposal would require that the institution's chancellor or president, or his or her designee, approve the

promotional activities that student-athletes are participating in. The exception is that the chancellor or president will oversee the activities to ensure that the obligation to protect the student-athlete from exploitation is balanced with the institution's need to enhance the mutual benefit derived from the relationship with corporate entities.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—RECRUITING ADVERTISEMENTS—SHARED HOME FACILITY

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): Speaking on behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the committee, I also move the immediate effective date for Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

This proposal would permit an institution's home facility that is also the home facility for a high school to advertise and upgrade that facility.

Under current legislation, amazingly enough, that would be precluded because it would be considered an impermissible financial contribution to a high school. An institution that wishes to share costs in the upgrade or renovation of the home facility should not be precluded from doing so. The purpose behind shared facilities is not to gain a recruiting advantage. Rather, it amounts to good business practice for many institutions. It amounts to community involvement and support, and it is crucial for many of our state institutions as well as some of our private schools.

If an institution has an opportunity to share costs to upgrade or renovate its home facility, that should be permitted without the practice being considered impermissible and without seeking a special waiver.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY—FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS—ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION—FINAL SEASON OF COMPETITION OR FINAL TWO FULL-TIME SEMESTERS OR THREE FULL-TIME QUARTERS

David Merrell (Abilene Christian University): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 22 amends the one-time transfer exception to specify that a student-athlete who has one season of competition remaining in his or her sport or two full semesters or three full quarters to complete his or her eligibility and who has not earned a baccalaureate degree, must have satisfactorily completed an average of 12-semester or 12-quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each term of full-time attendance, at any collegiate institution, with a cumulative minimum GPA of 2.0.

This proposal addresses the concerns of the Division II membership regarding four-year college transfers. In May 2005, the Academic Requirements Committee surveyed the membership regarding all transfer student-athletes from the years 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05 who had completed eight full-time semesters or 12 full-time quarters, or who had one season of competition remaining in their sport at the time of transfer. The survey results indicated that there are a large number of students who transfer at this late stage of their academic career.

By satisfying this additional component of the one-time transfer exception, a transfer student with one season of competition remaining in his or her sport, or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters to complete his or her eligibility and who has not earned a baccalaureate degree, will likely be in a position to succeed academically and will likely graduate from a Division II institution.

This proposal makes it clear that academics are a priority for Division II. For this reason, and for the rea-

sons previously stated, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Charles Ambrose (Pfeiffer University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 22.

For approximately the last four years, our membership, our conferences and the Academic Requirements Committee have discussed and considered many changes to the four-year college transfer rule and the one-time transfer exception to ensure that transfer students are making satisfactory academic progress before transferring to a Division II institution.

If we are truly concerned about the academic well-being of four-year college transfer students and their progress toward degree completion — with one season of competition remaining in their sport, or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining to complete their eligibility, and who have not earned a baccalaureate degree — then we will vote to approve this proposal.

This proposal will create a checks-and-balance system when certifying a four-year college transfer student with one season of competition remaining, or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining under the one-time transfer exception.

Some Division II institutions rely on the student's previous institution to verify that the student was in good academic standing and meeting the progress-toward-degree requirements before transferring to that certifying institution.

Under this proposal, both the sender and the receiver, the certifying institution, will rely on information, but will also have control in determining whether the student-athlete has an average of 12 semester or 12 quarter hours of transferable degree credit, applicable towards any of its baccalaureate degree programs for each full-time term of attendance, with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.0.

Further, this proposal will ensure that four-year college transfer students, with one season of competition remaining, or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining, are in a position to make the appropriate academic progress toward graduation.

This proposal makes sound academic sense. The Division II Presidents Council urges you to vote in support of this proposal.

Erin Merz (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 22.

Holding transfer student-athletes to a firm academic standard ensures that they are transferring for the right reasons, consistent with our Division II philosophy that academics are equally as important as athletics, upholding the "student" emphasis in student-athletes.

The additional academic requirements of this proposal will ensure that a transfer student-athlete is making appropriate academic progress toward a degree.

The Division II SAAC feels that legislation encouraging student-athlete graduation is in the best interests of student-athlete well-being. We encourage you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 22 was adopted, 247-10-1.]

ELIGIBILITY AND CHAMPIONSHIPS—PENALTY STRUCTURE AND CHAMPIONSHIP SELECTION PROCESS

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): On behalf of the Management Council and the Championships Eligibility Project Team, I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the culmination of two years of work by the Championships Eligibility Project Team regarding the important issue of individual and team eligibility for NCAA championships competition.

The Championships Eligibility Project Team is a broad-based group, formed by the adoption of a resolution at the 2004 Convention. At the 2004 Convention, two proposals that related to how sports committees should deal with eligibility of student-athletes for championship selection were either withdrawn or not moved on the

Convention floor. The Management Council and the Championships Committee agreed that if adopted, the two membership-sponsored proposals might have had unintended consequences for institutions seeking access to NCAA championships.

As chair of this project team, I deemed our charge to be two-fold. First, to study the proposals that were recommended by the sponsors. Secondly, to evaluate and recommend a plan of action with regard to the concerns that were raised by the membership. It is my opinion that the project team was successful in both of these areas.

The project team has recommended a series of changes that have been reviewed and approved by the Management and Presidents Councils. These recommendations were developed by a project team with representation from every Division II conference, and the proposal has been reviewed extensively at various membership meetings the past nine months.

We believe these changes will enhance institutional accountability and will help to ensure that eligible student-athletes are participating in our championships.

The first initiative is to clarify the authority of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. The second is to include the basic principle of championships participation for eligible student-athletes in our philosophy statement. The third is to institute a nullification system that penalizes offenders in an equitable and proportionate manner for championship selection. The fourth is to create a system that gives institutions the opportunity to verify and ensure the eligibility status of their student-athletes before championship events. The final initiative is to clarify the appeals process for secondary infractions cases.

I'm confident that these changes will provide us more assurances than in the past that we are protecting the integrity of our championships in Division II. No system is perfect and flawless; however, I believe that this system gives Division II institutions the best chance to monitor important eligibility issues.

I urge your support for this proposal.

Jill Willson (Texas A&M University-Kingsville): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak further to support Proposal No. 23.

This proposal strengthens the selection process for all individuals and teams vying for NCAA championships. Under current legislation, sports committees are left trying to determine the material contribution of an ineligible student-athlete or team and what impact this should have on selections. This proposal creates a consistent application for all sports committees with regard to the penalties assessed for competing with an ineligible student-athlete.

Further, participants in NCAA championships can be assured that each school has verified its student-athletes are eligible for competition. Providing schools with an opportunity to confirm that no issues have been raised regarding the eligibility of their student-athletes before selections continues to emphasize that institutions must deal with possible ineligible situations in a prudent manner.

Finally, with this proposal, we have demonstrated that we believe in equitable and fair access to Division II championships. I would urge your support of this proposal.

James Netherton (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 23.

Championships competition is of great importance to the Division II membership. We have an obligation to ensure that competition between selected individuals and teams takes place among those student-athletes who are eligible to participate according to Division II rules and regulations.

This proposal has a series of initiatives that encourages institutions to find eligibility considerations and address them immediately in order to be selected for championships. Also, it allows schools to verify the eligibility of their student-athletes before selection to NCAA championships. Finally, it provides for an appeals process that allows institutions to be heard if it is deemed necessary.

Voting in favor of this proposal enhances the credibility of our championships for all of those who participate and are involved in these tremendous events. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted, 253-1-1.]

**CONDUCT AND EMPLOYMENT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL—LIMITATIONS
ON COMPENSATION AND REMUNERATION—EMPLOYMENT WITH
PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS**

Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Proposal No. 24 provides an opportunity for staff members to be employed by a professional sports organization as long as the employment is in accordance with the staff member's institutional policy.

Currently, staff members may not accept compensation or gratuities for representing a professional sports organization as a coach or a scout in the negotiation of a contract or for the performance of other services that involve the observation of or contact with athletic talent, except during times when the staff member is not under contract with the institution. This proposal simply removes this limitation and would allow each institution to determine the appropriate conditions for which it would be acceptable for the staff members to be employed.

Additionally, by allowing some flexibility with income opportunities for staff members, a Division II institution may be more equipped to attract and retain staff members. For these reasons, I encourage your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 24 was adopted.]

**RECRUITING—CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS—CONTACTABLE
PROSPECTS—HIGH SCHOOL PROSPECTS**

David Merrell (Abilene Christian University): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to withdraw Proposal No. 25 because it is no longer necessary to provide Division II coaches with equal access to prospects.

Ms. Martin: The motion has been made to withdraw. We have withdrawn Proposal No. 25. We are now ready for Proposal No. 26. Please refer to the procedural issues document that was distributed this morning, and note the noncontroversial proposal that will take effect immediately if Proposal No. 26 is adopted. This noncontroversial amendment will make consistent the language in Divisions I and II.

**RECRUITING—RECRUITING ADVERTISEMENTS—NONATHLETICS
INSTITUTIONAL ADVERTISEMENTS**

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move for an immediate effective date.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Proposal No. 26 creates an exception to the hard and fast rule that institutions are prohibited from advertising in nonathletics high school publications or other nonathletically related publications. This proposal simply would provide institutions with an opportunity to publish nonathletics institutional advertisements in nonathletics high school publications, provided the funds generated from the advertisement are not used for high school athletics programs, the institution's athletics department is not involved in the advertisement, and that advertisements do not contain athletics information.

For example, it should be permissible for an institution's admissions department to place a general admission ad in a high school yearbook. If this proposal is adopted, such practice would be permissible. Further, at no point in this example was the athletics program involved with the placement of the admissions ad.

Since Division II is regional in nature, and in an effort for institutions to connect with the community, this legislation only makes sense. Please join me in supporting this proposal.

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I speak in favor of this legislation.

In the state of Kentucky, we have six Division I institutions. They are permitted and do use nonathletics advertisements at such events as the boys and girls high school basketball tournament. If you're not familiar with Kentucky basketball, that's about 23,000 people a night in the facility. As one of four Division II institutions, in the state of Kentucky, this legislation will permit us to do the same nonathletics advertisement.

This is not athletics advertisement for student-athletes. It is permitting all of our institutions to recruit students. This is an enrollment management issue, and I urge you to pass this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 26 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—TRANSPORTATION ON OFFICIAL VISIT—FROM AIRPORT

Duane Hopkins (Florida Southern College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I also move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Proposal No. 27 would permit any member of the institution's athletics department staff to provide ground transportation during an official visit for a prospect and any prospect's parents or legal guardians, between the campus and any bus, train station or airport.

This proposed change would remove the requirement that the bus or train station or airport be the one nearest the institution's campus. The nearest campus restrictions can sometimes increase the cost for institutions, and can sometimes create delays in travel.

This proposed change would allow institutions the flexibility to evaluate departure and arrival times and to choose the most economical and efficient method of transportation for the recruited student-athlete and the institution. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 27 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—PUBLICITY—ANNOUNCEMENT OF SIGNING

Robert Burke (American International College): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal 28.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Proposal No. 28 would provide institutions with some latitude in what forms of media they wish to employ in announcing the signing of a prospect. The proposal would make it permissible for an institution to release information related to the signing of a prospect to a media outlet, regardless of what media forum they normally have used.

The current legislation requires that the media forum used must be the same media forum normally used by the institution. This change would allow institutions to take advantage of the ever-changing technological environment and would potentially provide opportunities for institutions to be more financially efficient and effective in this regard.

Additionally, this proposed legislative change removes limitations on the number of occasions that the information may be released. If adopted, an institution will have the freedom to release this information as many times as it wishes. However, the institution would be prohibited from purchasing or receiving commercial advertising to be used to identify the prospect by name or picture. This proposal would not affect the current restrictions related to press conferences and the prohibition related to personal contact with the media at the site of the signing.

I request that you join me in support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 28 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—LOCAL SPORTS CLUBS

Robert Hiebert (California Collegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association, I wish to move Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

I also wish to move the immediate effective date.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

The California Collegiate Athletic Association members wish to alert you to this proposal, in that it does not change the original intent of this bylaw that was approved 15 years ago. It simply expands the 50 mile radius to a 100-mile radius. I think this better suits the needs of what's considered local right now, and it better serves the needs of prospective student-athletes and the coaches working at those camps. Thank you.

Ingrid Wicker McCree (North Carolina Central University): I rise on behalf of the Legislation Committee to support Proposal No. 29.

This proposal would expand the mileage radius to 100 miles for prospects participating in local sports clubs. This expansion is reasonable. In today's society, it is not unreasonable to think someone would drive 100 miles each way to be involved with a sports club. In fact, it is not uncommon for individuals to live, work and attend academic institutions outside of a 100-mile radius.

Under the current legislation, if a single prospect who participates on a local sports club team lives more than 50 miles from the institution, the institution's coach may not coach that club team. Changing the legislation from a 50-mile radius to a 100-mile radius of an institution is more realistic, and the bylaw would still contain the protection that the prospects must be legal residents of the area.

It is important to note that the Legislation Committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council all support this legislation. Please join me in supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 29 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY—CHANGE IN ELGIBILITY STATUS—EXCEPTION

Eugene Hermitte (Johnson C. Smith University): On behalf of the Division II Management Council, I move Proposal 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will establish an exception to the certification of the six-hour term-by-term requirement for institutions whose submission dates for grades is within three days of the first day of classes of the following term; or, for institutions with no official submission date for grades.

Institutions with official posting dates for grades that fall within three days of the start of the next semester would be permitted three business days from the date grades are acquired to be posted and to certify student-athletes' eligibility. Institutions with no official posting date for grades, whose submission date for those grades fall on or after the first date of classes, will be permitted five business days from the date the grades are submitted to certify student-athletes' eligibility. If the three- or five-day period expires prior to certification of a student-athlete, the student-athlete would be declared ineligible until certification occurs.

Lastly, institutions will be required to report to the NCAA the number of student-athletes who are ultimately declared ineligible, but who competed during the exception period. This issue has arisen at the Division I level, and this proposal is designed to assist Division II institutions that may face this issue by certifying student-athletes under the six-credit-hour rule. It's important to note that this exception only applies when the official posting date for grades or the submission of grades is after the first day of classes for the next term.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 30 was adopted.]

FINANCIAL AID—TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AWARDED INSTITUTIONAL FINANCIAL AID—PERIOD OF AWARD—ONE-YEAR LIMIT

Heather MacCulloch (Bloomfield College): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 31 is permissive legislation and will amend the period of the financial award to include the summer term immediately following an academic year.

Currently, an award for the summer term is considered an additional and separate award. As such, it is sometimes complicated and difficult to determine what funding will be available to student-athletes for summer terms and to determine which student-athletes will receive these awards.

The proposed change will permit an athletics grant-in-aid period to end at the conclusion of the summer term immediately following a regular academic year. This change will not affect the timing of the beginning of the period of the financial aid award, the triggers of determining the beginning of the period of the award, the policies and the rules set by the institution in administering the financial aid, or the monitoring procedures used by the financial aid office. This proposal only creates an opportunity to include the summer term as part of the existing year's aid, rather than being required to create an additional award.

This proposal is intended to allow student-athletes of institutions a better opportunity to plan the logistics of an academic year, plus the summer. By providing student-athletes earlier notice for their availability of financial aid, it will allow them to better plan their academic calendar.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Sunday Adesuyi (St. Paul's College): As a faculty athletics representative and a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 31.

This proposal will allow our institutions to include summer terms as part of the academic year's financial aid award, rather than requiring the creation of an additional award for the summer term. Financial aid offices will still be required to administer the financial aid and monitor the administration of the financial aid in accordance with already existing institutional policies and rules.

Additionally, institutions will still be required to apply its rules and policies consistent with the treatment of all other institutional aid provided to the general student body for summer terms.

For this reason, and the reasons already stated, I urge your support of Proposal No. 31.

Jennifer Churchill (Carolinas Virginia Athletics Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 31. An assurance of athletics aid for the entire academic calendar, including the summer term, will facilitate the student-athlete's financial and academic planning for the year. Furthermore, this proposal presents the theme of academic and athletics balance in Division II.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Derita Ratcliffe (Kentucky State University): I speak in opposition to this proposal because of what I think will come if this is passed.

This additional term of aid can be used as a recruiting tool, as opposed to actually helping those students who may need it to progress toward a degree or accelerating their academic work at their institution. I think it will be used to attract students and not be used for those who need it most. It will be offering that aid in advance of knowing where those students may lie. I think those funds will be directed in ways that we don't anticipate at this time.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The permissiveness of the legislation is where I have the greatest problem because I think it will create an advantage for the "haves" over the "have nots." I think it creates a recruiting advantage among the member institutions. I think it creates the climate on our campuses, where students will debate those who may receive this summer aid already permitted. It will create a climate of expectation in which student-athletes will look at it as an entitlement and not as financial aid given.

Our current system of awarding financial aid during the summer months is not broke so why fix it?

John Semeraro (Sunshine State Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Again, the Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 31. This is permissive legislation. The potential recruiting advantage that this proposal presents is a disparity that already exists among institutions — currently some offer summer aid and others do not.

The opportunity to have a definitive answer as to whether or not we will receive summer financial aid, assists student-athletes toward degree-completion planning — both financially and academically. We reiterate that this is permissive legislation. Many institutions are already granting summer financial aid.

Our committee is not asking that institutions spend more money. We're only asking that student-athletes are provided with documented financial information necessary to create an academic plan that will encourage degree completion within five years.

Again, we encourage you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 31 was defeated, 113-141-5.]

FINANCIAL AID—EQUIVALENCY SPORTS—EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Management Council, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Financial aid continues to be one of the most misunderstood and confusing topical areas in the NCAA Manual. This proposal attempts to simplify the calculation of an equivalency.

This proposal would permit an institution to use the actual or average amount received by a student-athlete as the numerator and the actual or average amount of the full grant in aid value in the denominator for equivalency purposes.

Permitting the actual amount received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the average full grant in aid as the denominator will simplify the equivalency calculation by creating one number to be used in the denominator for all student-athletes. Simplifying this process will enhance compliance with the financial aid bylaws and will create equity among all institutions.

The reality of a Division II campus has caused us to re-evaluate many of the legalistic processes in the Manual. Many have either been eliminated or revamped. This proposal streamlines the financial aid equivalency computations and will greatly reduce the man hours and resources it currently takes to complete an accurate and correct squad list.

In the spirit of deregulation, I urge your support of this proposal.

Rose Tseng (University of Hawaii at Hilo): As a member of and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I rise in support of Proposal No. 32.

When Division II underwent its deregulation efforts, the main objective was to simplify the legislation, and thus ultimately simplify compliance for our athletics administrators. This proposal is consistent with our regional charge of deregulation by permitting an institution to use the actual financial aid received by student-athletes, over the average full grant in aid for all students at the institution.

This method does simplify the legislation, and as a result, reduces the hours and resources needed to calculate financial aid equivalencies. All Division II institutions are required to juggle many responsibilities. Therefore, as Division II members, we should be in favor of any legislation that assists us with complying with NCAA legislation through the most effective and efficient means possible.

I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 32 was adopted, 232-2-1.]

AWARDS AND BENEFITS—EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION—TRAVEL APPAREL

Ingrid Wicker McCree (North Carolina Central University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution to provide student-athletes with team travel outfits or apparel to be used for travel to and from competition. This is permissive legislation, and if passed, this proposal would not require an institution to provide these apparel items to the student-athletes.

Because student-athletes are representing the institutions for which they compete during their away from home travel, I support the idea of an institution having the discretion to provide student-athletes with apparel so that they have a uniform appearance when traveling. In addition, we need to recognize that not all student-athletes are able to afford to purchase their own travel apparel if an institution currently has a specific dress code.

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, and in the spirit of institutional discretion, I encourage your support for Proposal No. 33.

[Proposal No. 33 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS—SKILL INSTRUCTION

Robert Burke (American International College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 34 will permit student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in sports other than football to engage in countable athletically related activities outside the playing season in a more flexible manner.

Current legislation dictates that skill instruction in sports other than football is permitted outside the declared playing season, providing no more than four student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coaches at any one-time in any facility. We all recognize that this legislation can be difficult to monitor and apply at times.

This proposed change would address those difficulties by permitting for individual and team skill instruction in sports other than football outside the declared playing season to take place on more flexible terms with more specific safeguards in place.

This proposed change would allow any number of student-athletes from one team and coaches from the same team to engage in countable athletically related activities, provided that the student-athlete does not do any of the following: 1. Exceed the maximum of eight hours of countable athletically related activities per week; 2. Devote any more than two of the eight hours to individual or team skill-related instruction; and 3. Not engage in countable athletically related activities one week before the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of the student-athlete's final exams.

This proposal would benefit student-athletes and coaches by using the restrictions for out-of-season skill instruction by minimizing the difficulties in the application and monitoring of the rule, while not sacrificing the safeguards established for the well-being of student-athletes. I strongly urge you to join me in supporting this proposal.

Leon Kerry (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): We stand in opposition to Proposal No. 34.

We think it would be difficult to manage, not student friendly and cause uncontrollable effects for institutions.

Kenric Ware (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 34 for the following reasons: This change is student-athlete friendly, and it would help to alleviate some of the scheduling difficulties that student-athletes encounter during the off season.

Currently, some off-season skill sessions are held into the late hours of the night or crowded between classes during the day due to facility availability and the restriction of only four student-athletes at one-time. These late hours and hectic schedules are not in the best interests of our health and well-being. We are often missing meals and disrupting sleep patterns to accommodate facility usage.

We also feel that any time spent together as a team is highly beneficial. With various schedules and separate practice times, fostering a team atmosphere in the off season can be difficult. Even though the time would be spent on individual instruction, this proposal allows for the development of the team concept throughout the academic year.

Finally, the SAAC would like to note that in our support of this proposal, we ask that this be monitored on campus with diligence and integrity.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): I've been through this entire process from the beginning.

I remind the delegates that this started out as a student welfare issue, in which we gave them out-of-season skill and conditioning time. Then we agreed later to give the coaches time to work with the individuals on a request basis. That was primarily as a result, at that time, to work with the walk-ons and the kids who didn't get a lot of time, so that the coaches could bring them along. Then the next time we bring it up, we increase the number, and we're up to four.

Now the coaches are saying and I understand the student-athletes' position here; they are doing this at odd hours and times — and complaining that they don't have the time to do this. Well, there's an answer to this. We can go back to no practice. We can go back to skill instruction, which is where we started with this.

With this type of amendment, we have coaches who will have our young men and young women with the ball on the court from the day they get there, through the season, and through the spring, until they go for summer.

I am strongly opposed.

Robertha Abney (Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 34.

As previously stated, Proposal No. 34 would amend out-of-season skill instruction legislation by removing the requirement that "not more than four student-athletes" from any one team may participate in such skill instruction with their coaches at one-time. This change, alone, would allow for coaching and student-athlete flexibility. The current legislation potentially places a huge strain on our coaching staff and student-athletes. Most coaches are interested in providing the same opportunities to each of their student-athletes. Imagine how much more efficient coaches would be with planning and monitoring out-of-season skill instruction if they do not have to limit the opportunity to a maximum of four student-athletes from the same team at any one-time. Additionally, think how much more efficient the scheduling of our facilities would be without this restriction. Perhaps more important, think how much more beneficial it will be to our student-athletes to deregulate out-of-season skill instruction.

This proposal would establish some very clear safeguards that protect our student-athletes' time and focus. This proposal is a step toward giving our student-athletes a way to improve in the off season without jeopardizing their academic endeavors outside of the playing and practice season.

On behalf of the Management Council, I request your support of this proposal.

Eugene Hermitte (Johnson C. Smith University): Speaking as faculty athletics representative and a member of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, we've had strong concern about raising the limit on the number of players. When you get above four, we're afraid that a lot of the instances of skill instruction are going to turn out to be team practice and ultimately required team practice.

We don't believe it's really possible to enforce this adequately. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee of our particular conference took a position in opposition to this proposal. So I urge the defeat of this particular proposal.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): I don't necessarily have a position on this, but I have a couple of questions.

I would like to hear some examples of skills that can only be practiced with more than four people. I can

think of crew, perhaps, although I do not even know if it's a Division II or a national collegiate sport. But other than that, I'm not aware of any examples. This could be ignorance on my part of sports that require more than four people for skill instruction.

Is this really an issue of student-athlete welfare, as we're being told by the SAAC at the national level, when this could lead to full team practices out-of-season all year long at 5:30 in the morning preceding 8 a.m. classes or at 11 at night? Do your facilities have the space to do this?

I don't know these answers. I probably will abstain on this. But I would like to hear those things discussed so I can make an informed decision. Thank you.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): I think those questions, Nate, are things that the membership needs to consider as merits of the proposal when they take their vote.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): At the annual faculty athletic representatives fall forum in November, the Division II Faculty Athletic Representatives Association voted unanimously to strongly oppose this proposal.

Contrary to the stated rationale for the proposal, we do not believe this legislation will more effectively use student-athletes' time. Indeed, we believe it would put further restraints on the time and academic flexibility of student-athletes out-of-season.

My colleague, Ed Harris, pointed out that over the years restrictions on voluntary skill instruction have gradually been eased, as we went from two, to three and then to four student-athletes. Two years ago, we acknowledged this was not voluntary skill instruction at all, but mandatory, and removed the "voluntary" language from the bylaw.

Each time skill instruction was expanded, concerns were raised that this was taking us toward out-of-season team practice. Each time proponents of the changes assured us this was not the intent. But out-of-season team practice is contrary to the philosophy of Division II. This proposal takes us where we said we would not go. This is out-of-season team practice. One cannot argue that this proposal would not impact student-athletes' time and academic flexibility.

Coaches now can plan individual skill instruction around the schedule of the student-athletes. With team practice, student-athletes will be forced to work their schedules around the team practice time. If the team is going to have this instruction Wednesday from 3 to 5 for example, student-athletes will be under considerable pressure not to miss the one team practice per week. If they have a paper to write or an exam to study for or a group project, they will have to make a choice about what they are going to do.

The proposal acknowledges this impact on academics by prohibiting athletics-related activities the last week of class and during exams. The rationale states that this prohibition will "ensure that time is available for study." While faculty athletic representatives applaud any legislation that promotes the academic welfare of student-athletes, we are compelled to point out that student-athletes might have time available to study all 15 weeks of the semester, not just the last week.

Further, once we cross the threshold with out-of-season practice, we all know where this will likely take us, just as we all knew voluntary skill instruction would soon become mandatory. Within a year or two, we will see a proposal to deregulate the eight hours of athletically related activity on the grounds that such activity can already be required and institutions and sports should have the flexibility to schedule that time as they see best. When that happens, we will see out-of-season team practice four days a week, two hours a day.

Seasons in Division II are already long enough. Basketball is over five months long. Sports such as baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball have nontraditional seasons, in addition to the regular season. In most institutions there is now only about 10 weeks of an academic year in which there is not team practice.

We do not need to fill this time with more team practice. Making it easier for administrators to schedule facilities is not a sufficient reason to restrict the academic flexibility of student-athletes, and it is contrary to the Division II philosophy.

I urge the membership to defeat this proposal.

Megan Burd (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Again, the Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 34 for the following reasons: Part-time coaches are a factor for scheduling. Under current legislation, student-athletes are not always able to work with the coach that can best assist them with a particular skill.

We recognize and appreciate the concerns regarding student-athlete well-being, but as the voice of Division II student-athletes, we are confident in the intent of this proposal and that it is in our best interests provided it is diligently monitored. Thank you.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): I certainly support the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's stance on student-athlete welfare. As someone who manages budgets and athletic trainers at my institution, this is not student-athlete friendly in this respect — we have six full-time athletic trainers on our staff. I can guarantee we cannot cover full-blown athletics practice year round. It simply will not happen.

So for me to pass legislation that says I will allow full-time, full-blown practice like we're getting ready to vote on, is basically saying that I will allow my student-athletes to practice without medical coverage, which simply can't happen.

Now, is the current legislation working? No. I think it is bad legislation. I think it has not worked well for students, coaches or athletics facilities. But the reality of it is, my hope is, that we would defeat this legislation and be back here a year from now with something that's a little bit more sensible. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 34 was defeated, 103-152-3.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—SUMMER PRACTICE—FACILITY FEES

Mark Linder (Missouri Western State College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 35 would permit an institution to pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice or competition facilities by student-athletes who are engaged in voluntary athletically related activities during the summer.

Under current legislation, it is permissible for an institution to pay fees required to reserve a facility outside of the playing season and the practice season during the academic year. It is also permissible for an institution to pay fees required to reserve a facility during the institution's vacation period during the academic year. It is also permissible for the institution to pay fees for the student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities during the vacation periods that fall outside the playing and practice season.

The only time an institution is not permitted to pay these types of fees is during the summer.

Therefore, I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 35 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION—FALL SPORTS

Mark Linder (Missouri Western State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 36.

Proposal No. 36 would provide a consistent 13 week playing and practice season for the championship segment for all our fall sports.

In 2003, the Division II membership designated the Thursday preceding September 1 as the first day of competition for cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball. This change did not allow for 13 weeks of competition before the Thanksgiving weekend in every year. In fact, the change resulted in a loss of one week in the fall playing and practice season two out of every seven years.

In order to rectify this, the proposed change would amend the first date of competition to the Thursday preceding August 30. This change would provide for 13 consistent weeks for the championship segment for all fall sports in every year.

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I ask your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 36 was adopted.]

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—FOOTBALL FIVE-DAY
ACCLIMATIZATION PERIOD—WALK-THROUGHS**

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 37.
[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 37 would allow in football an institution to conduct one one-hour walk-through per day during the five-day acclimatization period, provided protective equipment is not worn, equipment related to football is not used and conditioning activities do not occur. This one hour walk-through is in addition to the other on-field practices that are currently permissible during the acclimatization period.

This proposal also permits an institution to conduct one on-field testing session per day, not to exceed one hour in length and one on-field practice not to exceed two hours in length.

Please note that to address the health and safety concerns of student-athletes who engage in the one-hour walk throughs during the five-day acclimatization period, the proposal specifies that an institution must provide such student-athletes with three hours of recovery time between any and each session that day. During the recovery period, student-athletes are not permitted to engage in any athletically related activities, but may receive medical treatment and eat meals.

I ask football schools and conferences to please join me in support of this proposal.

Monique Morgan (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): For the same reasons we defeated Proposal 34, we urge you to defeat Proposal 37. We feel that it is not student-athlete friendly, and it is difficult to monitor.

James Netherton (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal 37.

This proposal permits an institution to conduct one one-hour walk-through each day during the five-day acclimatization period. This proposal will also permit an institution to conduct on-field testing sessions such as agility testing, provided the institution does not conduct an on-field practice session of more than two hours that day.

When the acclimatization period was originally adopted for the sport of football at the 2003 NCAA Convention, it was adopted to minimize the health and safety risks for football student-athletes during the pre-season period. This proposal continues that original intent by still limiting any physical activities, such as on-field testing or on-field practices to no more than three hours per day during the first five days of football pre-season and still requires three hours of continuous recovery between any sessions each day.

This proposal simply provides increased flexibility to institutions but maintains the original intent, which was to minimize the health risks to football student-athletes. For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal 37.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): I have some of the same concerns I had when I was here before.

When we put this legislation through a year ago, it was for health and safety reasons. I don't believe we've had much time to gather that research yet. We also gave football five additional days to do this. So we've given them time to do it. I don't see that there's a need to change this process until we gather the research to make sure we have accomplished what we want to do.

I think walk-throughs are going to be very hard to monitor. Thank you.

Cory Cangelosi (Gulf South Conference): I'm a football student-athlete, representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 37 for the following reasons: Walk-throughs are essential in developing a successful football program. Moreover, we believe student-athletes' well-being will be maintained by ensuring academic orientation activities are not encroached upon.

Finally, always keeping the health and safety of the student-athlete in mind, we know that the nature of these walk throughs is more mental exercise than physical exertion and therefore believe the mandatory three-hour recovery period will allow ample time for regeneration.

[Proposal No. 37 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—GOLF—PRACTICE AND COMPETITION DATES

Carl McAloose (Florida Gulf Coast University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 38 specifies that an institution that sponsors golf may count a total of up to five multi-day golf tournaments as one date of competition, or as one of 24 dates during the nonchampionship segment of the golf season.

Under current legislation, each day of a multi-day tournament must count as one of the 24 practice or competition days permitted in the nonchampionship segment, which limits the amount of preparation a team can secure before competition.

For example, a three-day tournament that consists of one day of practice rounds and two days of competition, counts as three separate days of the 24 practice and competition days of the nonchampionship segment. If the proposed legislation is adopted, this same tournament would count only as one day of the 24. Therefore, the proposal provides flexibility in order for coaches to ensure they have sufficient practice time outside of the competitions to work with players.

I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 38 was adopted.]

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS—CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Management Council, I move for the immediate effective date of Proposal 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

Derita Ratcliffe (Kentucky State University): I want a clarification on the immediate effective date. Would that mean that for the current academic year we would have to go back and have those affected staff members sign the form?

Richard McGlynn (NCAA Staff): No, you would not have to go back and do that.

Ms. Martin: Thank you. We will now vote on the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was approved.]

Ms. Willey: Proposal No. 39 would require all athletics department personnel, including clerical staff members who are involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution's athletics department, to sign the certification of compliance forms.

These individuals have extensive knowledge of the inner workings of the athletics department and observe the daily interaction between athletics department administrators and student-athletes or prospective student-athletes.

Students or student-athlete employees who are only responsible for the completion of clerical duties would be exempt from signing the form because they likely do not have the same level of knowledge regarding the day-to-day operations of the athletics department.

I strongly urge that you support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 39 was adopted.]

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS—10-SEMESTER/15-QUARTER RULE WAIVER—STUDENT-ATHLETE NOT USING A SEASON OF COMPETITION DURING INITIAL YEAR OF COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT

Kathleen Heitzman (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, I enthusiastically move Proposal No. 40, our last proposal of this 2006 business session.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 40 would establish an exception to the 10-semester/15-quarter extension request waiver. A student-athlete would meet the exception if he or she did not use a season of competition during his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment and meets the following conditions: The student-athlete was a qualifier; the student-athlete did not compete in his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment, but was otherwise academically and athletically eligible and was on the institution's squad list during the initial year of collegiate enrollment; the student-athlete was denied another participation opportunity as a result of circumstances beyond his or her control following his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment; and the institution files the extension waiver before the beginning of the student-athlete's 11th semester or 16th quarter.

As many of you know, the majority of decisions regarding whether a student-athlete competes in his or her initial year is not a circumstance within his or her control. Many times the decision is made by the coaching staff at the institution, and the student-athlete has little input. Therefore, that results in a loss of participation opportunity for the student-athlete.

Under this proposal, a student-athlete would not be penalized if in the latter part of his or her academic career, the student-athlete experienced a circumstance beyond his or her control. For example, an injury which resulted in an additional lost opportunity.

Finally, it is important to note that the student-athlete reinstatement staff, per the legislation, reviews all extension requests. The same would hold true if this proposal is adopted. An institution would not be permitted to self-apply this legislation, but rather would be required to submit an extension request to the student-athlete reinstatement staff and committee.

This process continues to ensure that the circumstances satisfy the intent and application of the legislation. This proposal furthers the principle of student-athlete well-being. For the reasons previously stated, I urge your support of this proposal.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): I realize I may be adding to my workload as chair of the Legislation Committee Subcommittee on Interpretations. But what effect will this have on student-athletes who have either less school or have previously endured this loss of a term, and would now seek to regain it?

For example, if this injury or other situation arose three years ago, would that student-athlete be eligible to have the extra year of competition opportunity returned to him or her, or will it begin with those student-athletes who suffer some kind of an event this coming August or September?

Ms. Heitzman: I'm going to defer to the dais. I don't know the answer.

Ms. Martin: Rich?

We're having a little conference here. We'll take care of this in a minute.

Mr. Salant: If it's any help, I believe that when we changed the medical hardship waiver rule, it was not retroactive. I don't know that that would apply to this or not.

Richard McGlynn (NCAA Staff): Nate, to answer your question, the legislation as drafted is not retroactive. Therefore, a student-athlete who had an injury in his or her first year, although it may be three years ago, would not fall under this proposal.

If that's something that the reinstatement committee would like to do, it would have to come back with another proposal to make this retroactive.

Mr. Salant: Thank you for the clarification.

[Proposal No. 40 was adopted.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Ms. Martin: Congratulations. We have completed our voting with very few delays. Thank you for your patience.

I would like at this time to open the window of reconsideration for all of the proposals we have considered. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of a proposal may move for reconsideration.

Derita Ratcliffe (Kentucky State University): Actually, I have a point of clarification and want to share

some information with the entire membership regarding Proposal No. 11, the waivers for private institutions.

I asked a question of the staff. If they could share that with the entire membership, because I know there has been some discussion among groups about the issue regarding in- and out-of-state tuition at private institutions. Many of us are not aware of any private institutions with in- and out-of-state tuition rates.

Mr. McGlynn: I'm not sure I understood the question. Is it a question of parity? Is that the question?

So the question is, are we aware of any private institutions that are doing this? The answer is, no, we are not aware of any private institutions, because under the legislative authority that's currently enacted, it's not permissible. It would have to count toward an equivalency. So if they had an out-of-state tuition at a private institution, you would still count it in an equivalency.

Ms. Ratcliffe: I may have been less than clear.

I was asking whether or not you're aware of any private institutions currently who have in- and out-of-state institution—not if they are giving waivers, if they have two tuition rates.

Mr. McGlynn: Thank you. Now I understand. No, we are not aware of any.

Kelly Higgins (University of District of Columbia): I do not have a reconsideration here, but I have a comment.

For the past two to three decades we have had a friend in Division II, and this is his last Convention. He's proven himself a man of wit and character. He's shown it again today.

I think he needs to be recognized for the service he has given to the students and the athletes here for these many long years, as a friend to many of us and a mentor to many of us. I think there are so few times in this profession you actually get that pat on the back before you run out the door, I felt that it was important today that we recognize Ed Harris, West Texas A&M. (Applause.)

Ms. Martin: Ed, would you please stand.

Thank you all very much.

OPEN FORUM

Ms. Martin: This is now the portion of the program we refer to as open forum. If anybody wishes to make a comment or has issues they wish to place on an agenda, please go to a microphone.

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): I know you're tired of hearing from me, but I would like to thank Dave Pickle and his staff for the wonderful production of the daily NCAA News. Dave, it was an awesome edition. Thank you. (Applause.)

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Martin: Are there any further comments?

I'd like to offer thanks to the NCAA staff — to Mike, Terri, Jay, Rich, Steph, Phil, Ruth and all of the individuals who I've had the opportunity to work with this year. I'm including Dave Pickle and including the NCAA photographer for all of the Division II pictures that we've seen on screens throughout the conference.

I'd like to thank you all for your attention during these proceedings this morning.

I'd like to ask you to please peel the stickers off your voting units, and leave the voting units at your place. They will be picked up by the staff. Lunch will be served in the Capitol Ballroom downstairs. It will start at 11 a.m. I can't believe we're done 30 minutes ahead of lunch. That isn't the way we usually operate.

It's been a pleasure serving as the chair of your Presidents Council this year. I thank you all for your support.

The Division II business session of the 2006 NCAA Convention is now considered closed. See you next year at the 2007 Convention in Orlando.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE REVIEW FORUM

SUNDAY, JANUARY 8, 2006

The Division III legislative review forum was called to order at 9 a.m. by Phillip Stone, Bridgewater College (Virginia).

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Stone: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to this forum to discuss our legislative proposals, and welcome to the NCAA Convention as it celebrates its 100th birthday.

I said to someone yesterday that while some of us will not likely be here for the celebration of the 200th, we would like to think that what we do over the next few years matters enough that people will be celebrating it and will be thinking of the 100th anniversary Convention as one that mattered. We want to make sure we are making our contribution to the history of this great organization.

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Division III session of the NCAA Convention. I am Phil Stone. I am president of Bridgewater College, and I chair the Division III Presidents Council. I will act as chair today. Joining me on the dais today are: Michael Miranda, the faculty athletics representative at the Plattsburgh State University of New York, and chair of the Management Council; Doug Hastad, who is the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, and a member of the Management Council; Ivory Nelson, who is president of Lincoln University (Pennsylvania), and vice chair and chair-elect of the Presidents Council; John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College, who serves on the Presidents Council and is vice chair-elect. They take their new positions immediately following this Convention. Also, we have: Suzanne Coffey, who is director of athletics at Bates College, and former chair of the Management Council; Georgana Taggart, who is faculty athletics representative of the College of Mount St. Joseph, who serves again this year as our parliamentarian. In addition, on the dais are: Dan Dutcher, our NCAA vice president for Division III; Bridget Belgiovine, who is the director of Division III; Leah Nilsson, who is associate director of membership services and Division III governance at the national office, and is our primary Division III legislative liaison; and Matt Banker, an assistant director of membership services, who also serves as the Division III governance liaison. Leah and Matt will be our experts today for purposes of interpretation as they will tomorrow as we look at our legislation.

Mike, Doug, Ivory, John, Suzanne and I are participating in this session as members of the joint committee of the Presidents Council and Management Council and representatives of a subcommittee to look at the future of Division III Phase II.

Several other members of the Presidents Council and Management Council also served on that joint subcommittee during the past two years. I would like to acknowledge them because they contributed greatly to the work of the committee. I would like for them to stand as I call their names: Dale Knobel, Denison University president; Deborah Stanley, State University of New York at Oswego; and Jennifer Watson, Nebraska Wesleyan University.

From the Management Council: Steve Argo, commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference; Jennifer Braaten, president of Ferrum College, who had a pass this weekend. Her daughter is getting married. Val Cushman, director of athletics at Randolph-Macon Woman's College; Travis Feezell, director of athletics at Macalester College; John Johnson, faculty athletics representative at Alfred University; Heather Mathis from Maryville College (Tennessee), student-athlete; Dave Muscalonus, student-athlete from Penn State-Behrend; and Dick Strockbine, director of athletics at the University of Dallas.

Please join me in thanking them for the hard work they have performed over the last two years. (Applause)

Our primary focus for this session will be to review and hear information about the 29 proposals in your Official Notice for legislation tomorrow. While some of those you will hear later may have been affected by efforts to withdraw or intentions to withdraw, they are officially before you in the Notice. We will be mentioning all of those today whether or not they continue to have the endorsement of the original sponsoring group.

There are 29 proposals with related amendments. They are all going to be considered. We will address these

proposals today by legislative topic. We have grouped them according to topic areas. They will not be presented in numerical order. We are trying to do them by group so that we can link discussion.

Each group of proposals will be presented by a member of the future of Division III subcommittee who worked on that subject matter during the last two years. Their task will be twofold. First, to review the details of the proposals to make sure that we all understand them as well as we can, that we see all the key components, the intent, the effective dates, how they might work; and secondly, after we do a review of the 29 proposals, to have discussion, questions and answers or reflection, as time permits.

We will have about 30 minutes available for each of the first three proposal groups, and then we will have 25 minutes for the final grouping. It may run longer and it may mean it will be difficult to have time for questions and answers, but that will also mean that you probably are getting some additional information as we go. Our hope is that we would have some time left for you to ask some questions.

Let me say a word about how these are presented. You know from past practice, and I am sure you know from the Official Notice and other communications, that I have written all of your chief executive officers. For those of you who are presidents, you have received letters indicating that the Presidents Council and the Management Council have taken positions on this legislation, have sponsored some legislation that we strongly feel ought to be passed and indicate opposition to legislation that should not be passed.

The purpose today is not to advocate or to lobby for any particular legislation. The people presenting it today are doing it to try to provide information. The person going to the microphone may not even be in support of that particular piece of legislation. It may be conflicting with another piece of legislation because they come from different sources. They mean to do different things. Our job is to try to present it in some objective, neutral way to try to help everybody understand it. I wouldn't want you to misinterpret that to mean a lack of advocacy at the appropriate time. Today is not the time for it. If we have time for a question-and-answer session, that would be a good time for us to say we are for this or against that. This is really for information. This is really to try to understand, not to advocate. Tomorrow we have a chance to speak and vote according to our preferences. Today there will be a very hard effort made to try to provide good information. We have tried to avoid having too many hand-outs, but you will find some reference sheets that will help you follow the discussion better. We will use the PowerPoint format. All of the material is available on the Internet.

As we begin, we think it is important to take a step back and set a context for work at this Convention and for discussion this morning. You may remember that in 2004, when we passed a package of significant legislation, among those bills passed was Resolution No. 66, which called for us to look at the future of Division III. Even though we had done a lot in 2004 in terms of making decisions, we really wanted to make sure we continued the inquiry into what should we look like in the future? What are our characteristics? What is our philosophy? Do we still have a shared philosophy? Are we okay with that? It was a very broad question. As we looked at that resolution and put this subcommittee together, we felt that we should not be driven by any determination in advance to come up with legislation or rules. It really should be an open discussion with the membership. There were focus groups. We had round-table discussions at last year's Convention and made notes. The subcommittee has worked. All kinds of input have been gathered to try to find out what the membership thinks about our future and where we should be headed.

What you see to a great extent at this Convention is the work of the membership as it has looked at the question about the future. Obviously, as we have done that and as we continue our work, communication has been critical to try to find out what people think and try to give everybody a meaningful way to participate. I now would like to turn to Mike Miranda, who will review those communications efforts that we have engaged in over the last couple of years.

COMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

Mike Miranda (Plattsburgh State University of New York): Thank you, Phil. As Phil said, communication was really essential as we began the close exploration of what the future of the division was going to be. That communication took many different forms in printed context.

We started with the quarterly Division III newsletter, The NCAA News, the membership-wide mailings and the Division III commissioners' monthly update. This was a way of making sure that we had materials in the hands of those folks on the campuses who needed to know what was going on and also helped to inform the discussion as we proceeded.

We also went through a fairly significant effort of in-person communications. Each member of the Management Council was responsible for serving as a liaison to one, two or in some cases three different conferences. We attended the meetings and spoke with and got feedback from the various members of those conferences to try to help inform as to what we were doing and to gather information as to what the membership themselves thought we should be doing. We also made the effort to go for regional and national presentations. We spoke at the regional rules seminars and at the faculty representatives association meetings and really took as many opportunities as we possibly could to engage the membership in in-person communications.

In the summer of 2004, we decided that it might be appropriate to try to use what we referred to as virtual focus groups. We established these focus groups based on the various conferences and the group of independents and included chancellors, presidents, ADs, the SWA, the faculty rep and student-athletes and, of course, the commissioners and eventually two coaches from each conference. We engaged them in an electronic version of a focus group. The updates from those virtual focus groups were forwarded after the quarterly Council meetings. Today, we have 100 individual responses from 34 different focus groups.

We felt that was a reasonable means of communicating with the membership and allowing for some greater discussion. In the future, we felt that this was a reasonable and effective means of gathering information. We are looking forward over the next year to try to determine how best to continue this process.

We might continue with the focus groups as they are. We might modify that in some way, but our commitment to communicating to the membership using electronic formats and the latest technology is going to continue in some manner. It also became very clear when we first started this effort that legislation was not going to be the only results of the efforts that we were putting forward.

It became clear—despite the 29 proposals that are before us—that legislation is not the only way to proceed. In fact, we decided that many, many institutions have already instituted policies and procedures and significant efforts on their campuses that helped to advance the Division III philosophy and helped to ensure that students and student-athletes are at the center of what we do.

We decided that it would be reasonable to try to get individuals to share those efforts. So we decided to try to compile a best practices document. This is something that is not going to be an individual or one-time deal. We hope to continue it.

The member institutions and conferences submitted 98 examples of best practices. We had them divided into three different categories: the academic success of student-athletes; cultural and campus integration; and sport and program equity. The oversight group sat down and reviewed each of these proposals and decided that some of them were truly outstanding. All of them were significant and worth noting, but we felt that there were some that really did stand out. Those items have been compiled and are on the CDs that you have at each chair. That is what you will find on that CD—the compilation of those best practices. We think that they provide some real insight, some very innovative approaches and some things that we hope that other companies and other institutions will find useful as they look at the way that they do things on their campus. We hope you will be able to make use of that. The compilation is also available at the Division III Web site. You can find it there. We would be interested in hearing any feedback on the implementation of some of those best practices on your own campuses. Again, it is an informational process.

This is not a recommendation necessarily as to how you should be doing things. The individual campuses have their own cultures, have their own approaches and have their own thoughts on how things should be done. The notion behind the best practices was simply to say this is how some institutions have done things, and this has proven to be successful at those institutions. We tried to share that information as broadly as we can so that people can make use of the efforts from other campuses. We want to continue that sharing of information. Submissions can continue to be made at the Division III Web site under the “best practices” link. There will be a process established to continue review of those submissions, and to make sure that those best practices that do

come in over time will be re-distributed to the membership so that they can continue to build on the good efforts that we see at various campuses.

Long term, it is likely that various other organizations will take on that effort as well. I think that the college sports project has taken a leadership role in this effort. They have adopted the notion of best practices as a way of communicating with the membership and sharing some of the things that they are doing. FARA, the national association of Division III ADs and Division III commissioners have all expressed interest in and a commitment to continue on this effort and possibly take over the effort at some point as we move forward.

We can now turn to the review of legislation. You can see that it is divided into four different categories. I will turn to Doug Hastad to take over on the first category.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

Doug Hastad (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Good morning. My responsibility is to walk us through the proposed legislation related to management and growth of championships. You can find the information in the Official Notice. As Phil mentioned, these slides are intended to inform you in a very brief way about all of the legislation that will be before you tomorrow, and it is also intended to be presented in an unbiased fashion.

If you are interested in where various groups stand, you can find that in the Official Notice. I also would encourage you to spend time with your colleagues in the hallways afterwards as well.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT—ELIMINATION OF IN-REGION COMPETITION EMPHASIS

This is intended to eliminate the emphasis on in-region competition within our philosophy statement and the championships selection process for all Division III team sports.

It will become effective August 1, 2006. The source is the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, Northwest Conference and University Athletic Association. This has been withdrawn. As was mentioned earlier, even though it has been withdrawn, it is incumbent on us to put it in front of you.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS—SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION—MAXIMUM SIZE OF CHAMPIONSHIPS FIELDS.

The intent of this proposal is quite obvious—in team sports other than football, to establish maximum brackets of 64.

The reason that it would not be done in football—we keep that at 32—is simply because it would take longer than three weeks to deal with football. The effective date would be August 1, 2006, and the source is the NCAA Division III Presidents Council Future of Division III Phase II Oversight Group.

The football bracket is smaller in size and kept at 32 teams because the championship could not be conducted in three weeks. Of course, we are concerned about how that would impact on missed class time.

An important point, I think in all of this, is the championships access ratio would remain at 1 to 6.5, which is the ratio we tried to keep in championships. If any sports sponsorship exceeds 416—64 times 6.5—the championship would be capped at 64 teams. That formula would be used to determine where we would cap our championships.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS—SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION—PRIMARY CRITERIA—RANKING AND SELECTION—STRENGTH-OF-SEASON INDEX

The intent of Proposal No. 16 is to specify that the primary selection criteria for Pools B and C must include

the results of the statistical standing compilation based on the strength-of-season index. Creating a strength-of-season criterion would give committees another meaningful and objective reference to select Pools B and C teams.

The effective date would be August 1, 2007. The source is the Ohio Athletic Conference, College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Selection committees should only use this index when helpful. It should neither help nor hinder independents, who do not have a conference index. If adopted, the Championships Committee would develop an index based on samples provided by the sponsor before August 1, 2007.

The Championships Committee reviewed the opponent average winning percentage concept, which would potentially replace the strength-of-schedule index and consistently affect conference members and independents. Translated, many people have been looking at this. I think it will be a great source of discussion tomorrow and among your colleagues at other meetings. The opponent average winning percentage concept currently is under review with the sports committees. There was formal consideration by the Championships Committee in June 2006. This is another example of how people are really tuning into this particular concept.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP AND CHAMPIONSHIP SELECTION—MEMBER CONFERENCE— SELF-STUDY GUIDE AND LIMITED REALIGNMENT PERIOD

Basically, the intent of Proposal 13 is to require conferences to conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation at least once every five years, using a conference self-study guide.

Under this legislation, conferences would be expected to do what institutions are currently expected to do. It further specifies that for a two-year period, conferences that complete the self-study may remain eligible for the automatic qualification during that period without satisfying the seven-institution minimum or continuity of membership requirements.

The effective date would be August 1, 2006, which would begin the two-year window for completion of the first self-study. August 1, 2008, would mark the effective date for relief of the seven-institution minimum and continuity of membership requirements.

The source for this legislation is the Presidents Council Future of Division III Phase II Oversight Group. This would apply to existing conference bids. Existing automatic-qualifying conferences that drop below the seven members sponsoring a particular sport would retain automatic qualification for two years from 2008 to 2010. If the conference splits into multiple new conferences, each new conference with at least four core members from the previous conference, only one new conference would retain the automatic qualification.

This applies in a different manner than 14 and 15, so there is no “mootnicity.” For those of you who don’t understand mootnicity, you can visit with Dan Dutcher. He will explain it in great detail.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS—AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION—CONFERENCE REALIGNMENT PERIOD

The intent of Proposal No. 14 would be to permit a new conference to be eligible for automatic qualification for a limited time period.

The effective date would be August 1, 2007, and end August 1, 2009. The Commonwealth Coast Conference is the sponsor of this particular legislation.

To receive immediate automatic qualification, the conference must contain the majority of the members that come from the automatic-qualification-eligible conferences the most recent academic year. The new conference may contain no less than four members from any one conference the most recent academic year, and it would apply to conferences forming after August 1, 2007, and before August 1, 2009. A conference formed before August 1, 2007, would be subject to a two-year waiting period to earn automatic qualification.

It applies in a different manner than 13 and 15, so there is no mootnicity there. Again, if you don’t know what mootnicity is, I would encourage you to visit with Dan Dutcher.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS—SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION—AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION—SEVEN INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT—TWO-YEAR GRACE PERIOD

The intent of this proposal would be to provide conferences with automatic qualification status for a two academic-year grace period to meet the minimum member sponsorship requirement of seven teams should the conference fall below that minimum. If a conference falls below four core institutions, the grace period would become void and the conference would lose its AQ status.

The effective date would be August 1, 2006. The source was the Empire 8. It would not be limited in duration. In the awarding of AQs, the conference could retain as few as four core members during two academic years and still receive an AQ.

If the conference drops below four core members at any point, or does not have seven members at the end of the grace period, the conference loses the AQ and is subject to all existing AQ regulations to earn it back. It does not provide relief of the two-year waiting period for new conferences. Once again, there is no mootnicity.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—MAXIMUM CAPACITY

The intent of this proposal would be to establish a maximum number of active, provisional and reclassifying Division III members as of June 1, 2006. That would be this coming June.

It would permit all exploratory members as of September 1, 2005, in the total. It would permit current NCAA Divisions I and II members that choose to reclassify their institutions into Division III as of June 1, 2006, in the total.

The effective date is immediate for provisional and exploratory institutions. The effective date is June 1, 2006, for Division I or Division II institutions that do not submit reclassification applications on or before June 1, 2006. The source of this is the North Coast Athletic Conference.

This would establish the overall size of Division III membership. It would not specify which institutions may be members of a division, and the total number of institutions shall be established. For example, 455, and as institutions leave, others could join. There is probably a motion to refer to the Executive Committee Working Group on Membership Issues.

I guess what we are going to do is open the floor for discussions on any one of those proposals.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

John Schael (Washington University in Saint Louis): I have a question about Proposals Nos. 13, 14 and 15. What will be the voting order on those?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): The voting order as it stands today will be the same order as printed in your Official Notice. So it would be 13, 14 and 15 as originally published. We do want to make one announcement on 14 that was not in the PowerPoint. If you refer to the Official Notice correction section of your Convention Program, it indicates there was an error in your Official Notice. One very key word toward the end of Proposal No. 14 inadvertently was omitted. Proposal No. 14 applies to new conferences with no less than four institutions from their previous AQ conference. So, please refer to your orange Convention Program for the actual wording of Proposal No. 14.

Doug Hastad (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): I will back this up and we can go through them because we do have some time.

Are there any questions on Proposal No. 10?

Are there any questions on Proposal No. 11? This would be a very good time to ask if you have any questions at all.

Proposal No. 16—the Strength-of-Season Index, Conference Based—are there any questions on that issue?

Proposal No. 13—Conference Self-Study—are there any questions about that?

Proposal No. 14?

Proposal No. 15? Anybody seeking the definition of “mootnicity” yet? (Laughter)

Proposal No. 12—Membership Maximum Capacity. This the last call. Going once, going twice.

I’ll turn it over to my colleague, Ivory Nelson.

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: Good morning, everyone. It is my task to talk to you about proposals under the category of sports and program equity. I will be talking about Proposals Nos. 6, 7 and 8.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—SPORTS SPONSORSHIP—MINIMUM CONTEST REQUIREMENT

The intent of Proposal No. 6 is to revise minimum contest requirements for sports sponsorship to 70 percent of division-wide average number of completed contests. The effective date would be August 1, 2007.

The source of this proposal is the Division III Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Membership Committee. All completed contests against a varsity program of four-year, degree-granting institutions count toward the minimum. It includes all regular, pre- and postseason competition, including exempt contests, provided the contest is conducted in accordance with the sport’s playing rules. Postseason contests are used to determine average number of completed contests per sport.

This is in reference to Bylaw 20.11.3.3 and permits institutions to request a waiver of sports-sponsorship requirements from the Management Council on a recommendation from the Membership Committee. If institutions fail to meet the minimum contests requirement and do not receive a waiver, it loses championship eligibility for that sport, and that team cannot count toward its conference’s seven-team member for AQ eligibility.

The Membership Committee will engage in a regular review of minimum contest requirements based on completed contests. It will not continually adjust minimums to 70 percent of the average.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP—SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT

The intent of Proposal No. 7 is to increase the required number of sports sponsored to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from 10 to 14, based on institutional enrollment. The enrollments would be as follows: From 1,100 to 1,199—11 sports; 1,200 to 1,299—12 sports; 1,300 to 1,399—13 sports; and 1,400 and above—14 sports.

The effective date on this is a good ways out—August 1, 2010. The source of this proposal is the North Coast Athletic Conference. Institutional enrollment for sports sponsorship requirements shall be based on a rolling four-year average using the full-time undergraduate enrollment figure submitted for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act.

In accordance with the August 2010 effective date, the initial enrollment figure shall reflect dates from the 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years. Institutions are still required to sponsor a minimum of five sports for males or a mixed team, and five for all female teams no matter what.

Additional sports required may be for male, mixed or all female teams based on institutional discretion. A waiver of the sports sponsorship requirement is available for unique circumstances. The Membership Committee shall consider percentage of student-athletes in the student body when considering waivers, noting that 16-percent is the average for the division.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP—SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT—SIX SPORTS FOR MALES/MIXED AND FEMALE TEAMS.

The intent of Proposal No. 8 is to increase the required number of sports an institution must sponsor to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from five to six per gender for institutions with enrollments greater than 1,000 students.

The effective date for this will also be August 1, 2010. The source of this piece of legislation is the NCAA

Division III Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Membership Committee.

Institutional enrollment for sports sponsorship requirements shall be based on a rolling four-year average using the full-time undergraduate enrollment figures submitted for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act.

In accordance with the August 2010 effective date, the initial enrollment figures will be calculated to reflect data from the 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years. A waiver of sports sponsorship requirements is available for unique circumstances. The Membership Committee shall consider percentage of student-athletes in the student body when considering waivers, noting that 16 percent is the average for the Division. If Proposal No. 7 is adopted, Proposal No. 8 becomes moot. Again, consult Dan Dutcher.

Are there any questions concerning Proposals 6, 7 or 8?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): I want to make a clarification on Proposal No. 6. We have had some additional discussions this weekend with some of our Championships Committee folks. The PowerPoint slide today indicated that if the team failed to meet sports sponsorship minimums in a particular year, they would not be eligible for the championship in that particular year.

That is true either with the first strike or potentially it would be a warning in the first case, and then you would lose your eligibility in the second year that that occurred. So the Championships Committee will take a further look at that at their January meeting. We can tell you that there is an impact on your championships eligibility. What I don't know yet is if you get a warning year first or if it is an immediate impact. I wanted to make that clarification on No. 6.

Mr. Nelson: If there are no questions, I would like to turn it over to my colleague, Dr. John Fry from Franklin & Marshall College.

ELIGIBILITY—SEASONS OF COMPETITION

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): Good morning. It seems to me that as we look at this section of proposals, there is an important question we should ask ourselves. How do we ensure that our students take full advantage of their undergraduate experience intellectually, socially, civically, culturally and, of course, athletically? It also seems to me that the key factor in all of this is time. How much time do our students have to pursue all aspects of their undergraduate experience? How well do they use their time?

As educators—and all of us in this room are educators—it is incumbent upon us to make sure they have the time and they have the right kind of guidance in terms of how they allocate the time to these various pursuits. The proposals I will cover will be Nos. 3, 4, 5, 9, 17 and 18. I will comment briefly on the Presidents Council's position on each of these proposals.

We will start with No. 3. The intent of this proposal is to specify that a student-athlete uses a season of eligibility if he or she participates in any regular-season competition, which would include scrimmages occurring after the first contest or date of competition and competition in the nontraditional segment or postseason intercollegiate competition.

The effective date for this proposal is August 1, 2006. The source is the Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference, Keene State College, Plymouth State University, Rhode Island College and the University of Southern Maine.

This returns the competition standard to determine the season of eligibility and essentially reinstitutes the ability to redshirt. The effective date is not retroactive, so the student-athlete uses a season of eligibility by redshirting in 2004-05 or 2005-06.

The Presidents Council opposes this proposal. It believes it is in direct conflict with the 2004 reforms. We don't believe in extending the academic experience in order to facilitate the athletic experience, and we also believe that the current rule has flexibility to address special circumstances.

ELIGIBILITY—SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION—PARTICIPATION AT ANY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

I will turn to Proposal No. 4. The intent of this proposal is to specify that participation at any collegiate insti-

tution shall constitute the use of a season of eligibility. It would be effective August 1, 2006. The source is the Midwest Conference.

The season of participation standard applies to participation in any collegiate institution, including independent, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Christian College Athletic Association, junior college, foreign or other NCAA non-Division III institutions.

From a parliamentary perspective, if Proposal No. 3 is adopted, Proposal No. 4 becomes moot.

The Presidents Council supports this proposal. We believe that it applies a consistent season of eligibility standard to all regardless of prior participation at a non-Division III school. We also think it properly holds the student-athlete accountable for the prior decision to redshirt.

We believe strongly that the transfer should be based on regaining lost participation opportunities. It should be based on the quality of the undergraduate experience in Division III that the student-athlete would choose.

ELIGIBILITY—GRADUATE STUDENT/POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION—EXCEPTION

The intent of Proposal No. 5 is to permit a student-athlete who earns the baccalaureate degree at a four-year institution to be immediately eligible on transfer to a certifying institution provided the student-athlete has at least one year of participation still remaining, meets the exception to the transfer residence requirement and has more than two semesters or three quarters of eligibility remaining pursuant to the 10-semester/15-quarter rule. The effective date would be August 1, 2006. The source is the NCAA Division III Presidents Council and the Management Council Administrative Review Subcommittee.

From a parliamentary procedure, this has been withdrawn. I will comment on that in a second. If this is not adopted, an institution may seek to waive Bylaw 14.1.9 to permit the student-athlete to participate as a graduate or postbaccalaureate at a Division III institution where he or she did not attend as an undergraduate.

An Administrative Review Subcommittee waiver is required for mitigating circumstances that weren't relief from the normal application of legislation. The Presidents Council has withdrawn this proposal because it believes that these cases should be pretty rare, and that because they are pretty rare, they have some complications associated with them that they will probably require tailored administrative review.

So, essentially, we are withdrawing and re-emphasizing the authority of the Administrative Review Subcommittee to review the eligibility of graduate students and to grant waivers on a case-by-case basis. We feel that is a better way to proceed.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP—PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT—INTEGRATION OF ADMINISTRATION—ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE—ADMISSION POLICIES

Turning to Proposal No. 9, the intent is to amend the Division III philosophy statement to emphasize the following: that coaches play a significant role as educators; that the academic performance of student-athletes should be at a minimum consistent with the general student body; that admissions policies and procedures for student-athletes should be consistent with the general student body; and that the administration of the athletics program should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission of the institution.

The effective date would be August 1, 2006. The source is the NCAA Division III Presidents Council. It is essentially the result of work of the future Division III Phase II Oversight Group, and the philosophy serves as a guideline for institutions, conference, committees and councils to make policy and legislative decisions. The philosophy is not like other bylaws that have related enforcement provisions.

So this is a strong statement of philosophy that we think is more appropriate as we have thought about the work of various groups over the last number of years to make sure that athletics is fully integrated into the life of our institutions.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—EXCEPTION TO PLAYING SEASON LIMITATIONS AND CONTEST EXEMPTION—POSTSEASON CHAMPIONSHIP EVENT

The intent of Proposal No. 17 is to exclude in all sports the declared playing and practice season or part of one postseason championship event, and to exempt from maximum contest limitations one postseason championship event.

The effective date would be August 1, 2006. The source is the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, the Empire 8 and the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

This standardizes postseason contest exemptions. Every sport can exempt one postseason championship event sponsored by any organization, and each team could exclude all or part of one postseason event from its playing season. Events not currently excluded from the playing season would only be permitted to exclude one week.

The postseason championship is defined as season-ending invitational tournaments scheduled to occur after the conference or independents' championships, and shall involve competition between teams not identified until the close of the regular season. The sponsoring organization and selection requirements must be established before the first permissible contest date for the sport, and the sponsoring organization may not consist solely of members of any single conference that are already conducting conference championship tournaments or solely a group of independents that have already conducted an independent championship tournament.

The Presidents Council opposes this proposal. We believe it conflicts with the 2004 reforms. It lengthens the playing and practice season, and it also adds contests for some institutions and it takes away from the emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition, which is part of the principles of Division III.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT LENGTH AND MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS

The intent of Proposal 18 is to add four days of athletically related activity, and two dates of competition to nontraditional segments in baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball as specified.

The effective date is August 1, 2006. The source is the Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference, Keene State College, Plymouth State University, Rhode Island College and University of Southern Maine.

From a parliamentary perspective, this is withdrawn, although we understand that it may be re-introduced. There is a 20-day limit of athletically related activities that applies to a team as a whole. The institution may conduct athletically related activities on 20 different days during the nontraditional segment with no more than four days occurring in one week. It is permissible to conduct split squad parties on any or all of the 20 days.

This is related to Proposal No. 63 from the 2004 NCAA Convention. It only included sports historically limited to the five-week nontraditional segment. Sports not included in the proposal are unaffected.

The Presidents Council opposes this proposal. It conflicts with the 2004 reforms. It lengthens the nontraditional segment by adding athletically related activities and contest dates for some sports.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

I want to go back and walk through each of these to see if you have any questions or comments or need clarification. Let's start with Proposal No. 3. Are there any questions on that?

Jim Nelson (Suffolk University): President Fry, you mentioned that the current rule provides for some relief on special circumstances. Could you provide me an example of those special circumstances?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): Which particular proposal are you referring to?

Mr. Nelson: Proposal No. 3—the so-called redshirt.

Ms. Nilsson: I want to make sure I understand your question. Are you asking when you could practice for an entire season and not be charged?

Mr. Nelson: President Fry indicated that the current rule provided relief for special circumstances. I was

wondering what a special circumstance was. Have any come across the desk?

Ms. Nilsson: There is an academic exception to the current prohibition against redshirting in which if a student engages in something like study abroad, student teaching, etc., during the traditional segment, then he or she could practice for the entire nontraditional segment and not use a season of participation.

Mr. Nelson: Tell me a little bit about international students, particularly in the fall, who may arrive on your campus after a season has begun.

Ms. Nilsson: If any student—whether they are international or domestic—arrives to your campus after the season has begun, they have a limited opportunity to practice before they are charged with the season. They would practice from the date they initially engaged with the team until the next contest date. It may be only a day or two, but that is a decision that the student would make essentially arriving after the first contest.

Mr. Nelson: How unfortunate. Thank you.

Doug Atkins (Colby-Sawyer College): I need a point of clarification. I thought that Doug Halstad stated up front that there would not be any comment on support or lack of support for any other proposals. We have not heard that about the position of the Presidents Council with the other presentations. What makes this different?

Mr. Fry: It was a choice I made to express the Presidents Council opinion and to state what it was. That was my judgment.

Mr. Atkins: Thank you.

Mr. Fry: You are welcome. Are there other comments on No. 3?

Proposal No. 4. Are there any questions or comments on Proposal No. 4?

Wenmouth Williams (Ithaca College): Can I go back to No. 3, please? I didn't pop up quickly enough. Approximately how many students do you think would be affected by Proposal No. 3? Can you give me an idea of how many redshirted students we had before the 2004 change?

Mr. Fry: Do you want to answer that, Leah?

Ms. Nilsson: We don't really have a way to predict that. That may be something you can discuss in your conference meetings anecdotally, but we don't have a way to check on that.

Mr. Fry: Are there any others on 3 or 4?

Are there any questions or comments on No. 5?

Linda Moulton (Clark University): Could someone give us a couple of examples of what would be considered mitigating circumstances? Even though this has been withdrawn, it certainly doesn't change the impact that currently is in place. What are some examples to allow graduate students to compete under the current legislation?

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): The mitigating circumstances that will be considered for waivers regarding the graduate student exception, at least in recent months, have been regarding accelerated academic programs in which the student's program is three academic years, for example, and they pursue a graduate or professional level program at another institution.

Other mitigating circumstances would be academic calendars. The subcommittee is still in discussions and looking for guidance from the Presidents Council and the Management Council to give guidance on particular circumstances that they will be looking for in waivers that involve graduate students.

Mr. Fry: Any questions or comments on No. 5?

We will move to Proposal No. 9. Are there any comments or questions?

Proposal No. 17. Are there any questions or comments?

Proposal No. 18. Are there any questions or comments?

I am going to turn this over to my colleague, Suzanne Coffey, who is director of athletics at Bates College. She will talk about other legislation.

AMATEURISM—PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): I will walk you through Proposals 1, 2, 19 through 29.

Proposal No. 1's intent is to revise the restrictions related to the use of a student-athlete's name or image in

institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit promotional activities, as specified.

If adopted, the proposal will take effect immediately. The proposal's source is the Presidents and Management Councils and it has the endorsements of the promotions task force. This proposal expands what may be included in the promotion. For instance, a picture of the commercial product could be included.

It limits the reference to the commercial entity to 25 percent of the entire promotion. The proposal also makes mandatory a chancellor or president, or designee's approval of a student-athlete's participation in promotional activities. The proposal also limits the promotion from featuring alcoholic beverages, tobacco products or performance-enhancing drugs and also specifies that the commercial entity shall not be one that promotes gambling. Use of the product by a student-athlete during the promotion is considered an implied endorsement and is prohibited.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—EXCEPTION

Proposal No. 2's intent is to permit institutional coaches to teach private lessons to a prospect, provided specified criteria are satisfied. If adopted, this proposal would become effective August 1, 2006. The proposal comes to you through the Presidents Council and the Management Council's Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

This proposal is distinct from the local sports club exception in that it allows a coach to provide private lessons directly to a prospect without requiring it to be conducted through a local sports club operation. Private lessons may include any instructive guidance to a prospect about a sport, including playing lessons.

A private lesson should not be used to test the prospective student-athlete's playing abilities or for other try-out purposes. The coach may advertise the private lessons through promotions that indicate that the lessons are available to the general public.

Such promotion should not be targeted toward any one prospect or toward prospects generally. Institutional facilities may be used for the private lessons if the coach pays the standard rate, if applicable, to use that facility and follows institutional policy.

Please note Page 14 of your Convention Program for corrections to the language of the Official Notice. It is a small correction, but one you might want to note. Under letter D, it should read "fees charged to the prospect" rather than "fees of the prospect."

Also of note, the Presidents Council decided at its pre-Convention meeting that it will not seek an amendment to an amendment; thus, Proposal No. 2 will apply to all sports. The presidents were persuaded particularly by the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee that the opportunity should be available in all sports and all coaches should have the same opportunity.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL—SELF-STUDY REPORT—FAILURE TO SUBMIT

The intent of Proposal No. 19 is to specify that a member institution that failed to meet the ISSG deadline shall be placed on probation, restricted status and corresponding membership on repeated failures of submission; further, to specify that the Management Council on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive the deadline if an institution demonstrates extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

If adopted, this proposal would take effect August 1. This proposal comes to you through the Presidents and Management Councils, having originated in the Membership Committee. These penalties were established to mirror those for Division III membership requirements, such as the five-sport, three-season requirement.

A failed submission occurs when the institution does not submit the notification of completion form to the NCAA during the academic year in which the self-study is due. For example, if the self-study is due June 1, 2006, and the notification of the completion form is not submitted by June 1, 2007, then the institution is considered to have failed in submitting that report.

Each institution's submission deadline is posted on the NCAA Web site, and all deadlines occur June 1 of a given year. The proposal indicates that an institution may be granted a waiver of this requirement if the Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, deems extenuating circumstances warrant such action.

FINANCIAL AID—FAILURE TO SUBMIT ANNUAL ELECTRONIC REPORT—APPLICATION OF RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP STATUS

The intent of Proposal No. 20 is to specify that an institution that fails to submit the annual financial aid electronic report be moved to probation, restricted status and corresponding membership on repeated failures of submission; further, to specify that the Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive the annual financial aid electronic report submission requirement if an institution demonstrates extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

If adopted, this proposal becomes effective August 1, 2006. This proposal comes to you from the Presidents Councils and the Management Council Membership Committee.

Similar to Proposal 19, these penalties mirror those for failing to meet the Division III membership requirements. A failure to submit occurs when the institution does not complete the report during the academic year in which it is due. Penalties apply when no report is submitted for the entire year. As indicated, reports are due September 30 of each year.

ETHICAL CONDUCT—UNETHICAL CONDUCT—PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Proposal No. 21 comes from the Presidents and Management Councils. If adopted, it will become effective August 1. Please also note that at its post-Convention meeting, the Management Council will consider applying an immediate effective date to this proposal if it is adopted.

The intent of Proposal No. 21 is to specify that unethical conduct shall include the knowing involvement in providing a student-athlete a banned substance, impermissible supplement or medications contrary to medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports medicine practice, or state or federal law.

PERSONNEL—LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS—EXHIBITION CONTESTS

The intent of Proposal No. 22 is to permit member institutions to scout opponents participating in exhibition contests. If adopted, this proposal becomes effective August 1. Proposal No. 22 is sponsored by the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

RECRUITING—OFFICIAL VISITS—MEAL LOCATION

The intent of Proposal No. 23 is to specify that meals provided to the prospective student-athlete and the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardians and spouse on an official visit must occur on campus and must be on a scale comparable to normal student life, but they may be purchased from on or off-campus vendors.

If adopted, this proposal becomes effective August 1, but also of note is that this proposal will be considered at the post-Convention Management Council meeting to become effective immediately if adopted.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—COMPETITION AGAINST PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

The intent of Proposal No. 24 is to specify that subvarsity teams may not compete against high school or preparatory-school teams. If adopted, this proposal also becomes effective August 1. The proposal comes from the Presidents Council and Management Council Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

If this proposal is adopted, no intercollegiate squad may participate against high school or prep-school teams. The varsity and junior varsity teams are given as examples in this proposal, but the prohibition would apply to freshmen and sophomore squads as well.

RECRUITING—PROHIBITED EXPENSES—DONATION OF USED ATHLETICS EQUIPMENT

The intent of Proposal No. 25 is to permit institutions to donate used athletics equipment to all youth groups, including high schools, according to the institution's regular policy regarding the discarding of equipment.

An institution may only donate to a high school or a bona fide mentoring institution, for example, Boys or Girls Clubs, or the YMCA or YWCA, rather than, for example, a local sports club. If adopted, this proposal will become effective August 1, but again like the others, this proposal will be considered at the post-Convention meeting for an immediate effective date. The proposal comes from the Presidents Council and the Management Council Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

ELIGIBILITY—TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT—CHAMPIONSHIP ELIGIBILITY

The intent of Proposal No. 26 is to specify that a student-athlete who must complete an academic year of residence is not eligible to participate in any NCAA championships during the academic year of residence or during the vacation period immediately following the academic year of residence.

If adopted, the proposal becomes effective August 1, 2006. The proposal comes from the Presidents Council and Management Council ILC.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS—BENEFITS, GIFTS AND SERVICES— PERMISSIBLE—OCCASIONAL MEALS

The intent of Proposal No. 27 is to permit a representative of an institution's athletics interests to provide an occasional meal to a student-athlete at any location in the locale of the institution. There is not a specific mileage radius that defines the locale of the institution; rather, the locale is to be defined at the institution's discretion and would likely have different meanings for urban versus rural campuses, for example.

If adopted, this proposal will also be considered for an immediate effective date at the post-Convention meeting. The proposal comes from the Presidents Council and Management Council ILC.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—FIRST CONTEST AND PRACTICE DATE—FOOTBALL

The intent of Proposal No. 28 is to permit an institution to play its first football game on the Thursday before Labor Day in years when the first permissible contest date falls during Labor Day weekend; further, to permit a maximum of 25 practice opportunities before the Friday before Labor Day if the institution's first contest is scheduled for the Thursday before Labor Day.

Proposal No. 28 comes to us from the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. If adopted, it becomes effective August 1, 2006. This proposal moves back the first date of competition by a maximum of one day. As an example, under current regulations, the first permissible date of competition for the coming fall 2006 is Friday, September 1, which is 11 weeks before the first round of competition.

Because this falls during the Labor Day weekend this year, this proposal would move the first permissible contest date back to August 31, 2006. The formula to calculate the first day of practice will still count back from the Friday before Labor Day.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS—LACROSSE

The intent of Proposal No. 29 is to amend the maximum contest limitations to include 17 dates of competition in the traditional segment and one date of competition in the nontraditional segment.

Please note that if Proposals No. 18 and 29 are both adopted, lacrosse will have 17 dates in the traditional segment and three in the nontraditional segment. The proposal is sponsored by the Empire 8, and its effective date is August 1, 2006.

Let me ask now if there are any questions on Proposals 1 and 2, and 19 through 29. We will go back to 1 and 2.

Dan Harris (Milwaukee School of Engineering): Regarding Proposal 2, a question came up among our coaching staff. Would it be permissible to have a student-athlete assist in these private lessons?

Ms. Coffey: I am looking to our experts here to the left.

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): We are having a powwow. Because of the nature of our Bylaw 17 regulations regarding the restrictions on coaches and student-athletes getting together for athletic-related activities outside their week, we may forward this particular question to the ILC. It has not come up yet. My initial reaction is that you would have to prove it was completely voluntary on the student-athlete's part because of the athletics nexus. But student-athletes are allowed to offer lessons similar to how the coach would potentially now be able to. I don't see a reason why they couldn't work together except for the Bylaw 17 issue.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Ms. Coffey: Are there any questions on Proposal 1?

Are there any additional questions on Proposal 2?

Let's skip to 19 then.

Proposal 20?

Proposal No. 21 or 22?

Proposal No. 23 or Proposal No. 24?

Proposal No. 25?

Proposal No 26? I feel like I am auctioning them off.

Any bids on No. 27 or 28?

Finally, any questions on Proposal No. 29?

Thank you. I will turn it back to Dr. Stone.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Mr. Stone: Thank you all for taking us through those proposals. What we do with our remaining time is up to you, but let me make a couple of observations. We hope you will take advantage of our remaining time to ask questions. We can go over any proposal you want to now. Identify the proposal and say what your concern or what your question is. With 29 proposals, you only have a couple of minutes to allocate to each one to fit it into our business time tomorrow. To the extent that we can get good information out here today and help facilitate that, this would be a great use of the time. On the other hand, I realize that the statements you want to make in terms of advocacy for or against a proposal, you may very well want to make when the proposal is in front of the delegate body, because you want to make it at the time that it has the power to influence the outcome. But if you have some comment you want to make in terms of a rationale for a proposal that has come, or any kind of statement of advocacy, it seems to me it would only be fair for you to have a chance to do that now. For whatever purpose you want to use this time, I'll recognize people at the microphone. Again, please refer to the proposal that you want to speak to. If you decide you are not going to use this entire time, we will quit early so that we won't keep you here if you don't want to. But we would like to take advantage of the time.

Kurt Beron (University of Texas at Dallas): I have a parliamentary question. For proposals like Proposal No. 5 that have been withdrawn—that is the one concerning graduate student eligibility—what is the parliamentary procedure if an institution wanted to bring it back up?

Georgana Taggart (College of Mount St. Joseph): Anyone can move the proposal once it is in the book. If the party that is moving it lets it pass, somebody else can get up and move it, but they have to have a second.

Mr. Stone: Maybe, Georgana, test me on this, but what we should also say is that after we approve our agenda in the morning, which presumably would be the Official Notice, there is a special parliamentary procedure if you try to bring something new that isn't in the book. But this book now belongs to you.

So if you move the agenda tomorrow, it is fair game to move the adoption of anything that is in there, whether or not you were the sponsoring group. I wanted to distinguish between something that is just off the wall that

hasn't come up, not in the book, not new business, that is not easily done. But this one belongs to you. When the Official Notice goes out, it belongs to the group.

Ms. Taggart: May I add a comment?

Mr. Stone: Yes, please.

Ms. Taggart: That is correct. Perhaps we should mention re-ordering.

Mr. Stone: Go ahead.

Ms. Taggart: Would you like to do that at this time?

Mr. Stone: Yes, that would be good.

Ms. Taggart: If you at the same time want to have a proposal re-ordered, when the agenda is moved at the beginning of the meeting, somebody can move to re-order any of the proposals. At that point in time, the body can vote on it. It takes a majority to re-order. If you want to re-order something after we have already moved the agenda, then it will take two-thirds to re-order.

Mr. Stone: Is this a follow-up to 3? I can't remember if I have got a different speaker. Let me go to Speaker 2. Then I will come back to you.

John Schael (Washington University in St. Louis): Getting back to Proposal No. 2. It has to do with an interpretation. For example, right now, the only two programs that cannot work with AAU teams or local club teams are basketball coaches in Division III. So the question with AAU comes up. If you are allowed to provide private lessons, can those coaches work with an AAU team? Perhaps there are five members of that team. Can they give group lessons there? I am not looking for an answer right now, but maybe you have it.

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): There is a current prohibition. Generally, the local sports club exception allows your coaches to be involved in local sports clubs, except your basketball coaches cannot work with AAU teams. Will the private lesson essentially be a way around that AAU prohibition? Because the private lessons are about one-on-one instructions, if the coach is attempting to work with an entire AAU team, that remains impermissible. If one AAU player approaches that coach about a private lesson, according to all the provisions we heard in the proposal, that would be okay. But if it is a way to really work with all five or six of those high school age individuals, that would not be permissible.

Mr. Schael: I can understand that. I know the intent of the proposal. I am not trying to argue with you, but the intent of the proposal is one-on-one. When I received the green sheets this morning, it indicated and it was very specific coming out in terms of interpretation that the intent is generally one-on-one. I just want to make sure I have clarified that so I can let our coaches know what the rule is.

Getting back to one other question about what to do with a member of your current team, the question was asked earlier. Let's say a tennis coach wants to give a private lesson to a prospective student in tennis. Can he or she have one of the team members hit with that prospective student while the coach is making the observation and teaching the finer points of the game?

Ms. Nilsson: Based on that fact-specific scenario, I would say that is not permissible. I think the question for the ILC to answer is if the student-athlete and the coach are both teaching, and the student-athlete is not being used in a demonstrative way by the coach where they are going to also watch the student-athlete engage in athletic-related activities. I would say that is for the interpretations committee to decide in February.

Mr. Stone: Do you need follow-up? You look like you might want to ask more.

Mr. Schael: Yes, but no.

Chairman Stone: Okay.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I would like to ask the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference about the purpose behind the change of the exhibition. Does it have to do with the recent passage of basketball or exhibitions allowed that now count toward your total game count, but don't count toward your record? Is that the purpose, Gary? That is my question.

Mr. Stone: Can you reference the proposal so people will know?

Mr. Kaiser: I am sorry. No. 22.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Association): That was the primary motivation, Dick, with the exhibition games. In the current legislation, a coach cannot even attend any of those games if that school

is on their schedule. So that was the primary motivation for that proposal.

Does that answer your question, Dick?

Mr. Kaiser: Yes.

Mr. Stone: Are there other questions or comments? You may make any comment about the legislation or process that you want to make. Would you like to go out and celebrate the 100th anniversary of the NCAA instead of staying in here?

Let me check one more time. I want to make sure you have a chance. If not, this session is adjourned. The presidents have an 11:30 luncheon. Please don't forget it. Be prompt. We are adjourned.

[The Division III legislative review forum was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.]

DIVISION III BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2006

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Presidents Council chair Phillip Stone, Bridgewater College (Virginia).

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Stone: Will you please take your seats? Let's get started with our business session.

Good morning everyone. I am pleased to call to order this NCAA Division III business session. I am Phil Stone, president of Bridgewater College. I chair the Presidents Council and will be chairing this business session with the assistance of Mike Miranda, who will be carrying part of the agenda a little later.

Joining me on the dais is Mike Miranda, the faculty athletics representative at Plattsburgh State University of New York. He chairs the Division III Management Council. Georgana Taggart is the director of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, and she serves as our parliamentarian. Dan Dutcher is the NCAA vice president for Division III. Bridget Belgiovine is the director of Division III for the NCAA staff. Leah Nilsson is the associate director of membership services and our lead Division III legislative liaison. Matt Banker is the NCAA assistant director of membership services. Also on the dais with us are Sameer Khan, who is a student-athlete and chair of the advisory committee, and is from Fairleigh Dickinson University at Florham; and Heather Mathis, who is a student-athlete at Maryville College (Tennessee) and is on the SAAC and is a representative of the Management Council.

I would also like to make a couple of clerical announcements. First of all, would you check your cell phone? Try to turn it into an off position or to vibrate. Try to not have it vibrate so much to make you jump up in the air ecstatically and claim you just had an experience. Seriously, if you can turn off all beepers and sounds, that would be helpful. In addition, while I certainly see no problem at the moment, sometimes when people go out and get coffee and take a break, it is tempting to just stand in the doorway so you can both observe and be outside. Try to keep the doorways open. We were asked yesterday for safety reasons to make sure that our exits are kept clear. To the extent that you need to be involved in conversations, ask your colleague to step outside so that we will all be able to hear. It is important that the people around you be able to hear what is going on in the front.

In a few moments, we will start the morning's business. The first thing we will do is adopt the Notice and Program, which I trust you have with you. Before that, we will have some other activities. First, we want to again call attention to the fact that we are celebrating our 100th year as an intercollegiate athletics association. We want to acknowledge the Centennial year as part of our session. We want to celebrate the student-athlete, which is the theme of the Centennial. This year, the NCAA has chosen as its theme the Celebration of the Student-Athlete, both as to the achievement of student-athletes and also the influence they have not only had on the institutions but on our society.

During recent days, we have heard many of these stories at the Convention, especially during Saturday night's Honors Celebration, which I should note included recognition of two outstanding Division III young people from Amherst College — track champion Carter Hamill, and lacrosse student-athlete Raul Altreche. I have heard from so many of you who shared the feeling that I had of just being in the presence of coach Wooden made the trip to Indianapolis worth it. As I sat up front, I thought to myself, I am just a couple of feet from this guy who I have admired so long.

To our student-athletes who are now seniors, and to the student-athletes who are still participating, we celebrate their participation in intercollegiate athletics. In that context, it is highly appropriate this morning to specifically celebrate the Division III student-athlete. All of us recognize the special dedication and commitment they bring to our campuses as students as well as athletes and understand the impact they have had among their fellow students and in your communities. As we will soon see, some also make their presence on the national and international stage. All are treasured and all are worthy of celebration.

In a few moments, we will hear from two representatives of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory

Committee whom I introduced a couple of minutes ago — Sameer Khan and Heather Mathis. But first, the NCAA staff has prepared a video commemorating this Centennial celebration, and we would like to show that to you now. I think you will find that it is a fitting and moving tribute not only to student-athletes past and present, but a recognition of the ideals that are paramount in Division III athletics. I hope you will enjoy this presentation.

[Note: An audiovisual was shown to the delegates.]

Sameer Khan (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): Good morning. I am Sameer Khan, a member of the golf team at Fairleigh Dickinson University at Florham, and chair of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Joining me on the dais is Heather Mathis, who recently concluded her senior year in soccer at Maryville College (Tennessee) and who currently serves as the SAAC representative on the Division III Management Council.

We appear before you this morning on behalf of the 24 members of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, who are seated in their traditional place this morning at the front of the meeting room and who, like all of you, are ready to tackle this morning's discussions of the important issues facing Division III. We are pleased to take these few moments before we begin that business to join with you to celebrate thousands upon thousands of individuals from all walks of life who have fulfilled a desire to participate in intercollegiate sports at one of our more than 400 Division III membership schools.

We appreciate this opportunity to pay homage to our predecessors on the fields and courts at Division III institutions, some of whom were presented in the video you have just seen, and many more who like them have taken the lessons they have learned in competition and in campus life to achieve success in just about any profession or calling imaginable — from ambassadors to auto dealers, elected officials to electrical engineers, medical doctors to ministers, attorneys to artists, factory managers to, as you saw a few minutes ago, farmers.

We also are honored this morning to represent the approximately 150,000 student-athletes who currently are playing or practicing sports on our Division III members' fields and courts, while also working hard toward degrees in our classrooms and laboratories and experiencing a rich and full collegiate life on our campuses and in our communities. Nearly 15,000 of those student-athletes participate annually in 27 Division III championships and also in Association-wide National Collegiate Championships. That may be where many student-athletes are most visible to many of you. However, that is just part of the story.

Student-athletes increasingly are present and active in other arenas too, not only in NCAA governance through the national SAAC participation in today's proceedings, but increasingly through conference and campus-based SAACs as well as Division III student-athlete leadership conferences.

Most important, Division III student-athletes are visible and have the greatest, most lasting impact on our campuses and communities. There, we take pride in serving as role models, as leaders among our fellow students and as active participants in making the cities and towns where we study and compete a better place to live.

Everything begins, Heather, on our campuses, and it is hard to imagine a better place to acknowledge the place of student-athletes in campus life and pay tribute to their success and achievements than in this room this morning.

Heather Mathis [Maryville College (Tennessee)]: Yes, Sameer, it begins on our campuses under the dedicated guidance of people in this room — our presidents and chancellors, directors of athletics, faculty athletics representatives, senior woman administrators, coaches, and many others who provide the opportunity and resources for student-athletes not only to participate, but to excel.

Sameer and I have had the opportunity through our roles in SAAC and through our positions on other Division III committees, including the Management Council and Championships Committee, to see that dedication first-hand. Like student-athletes, those of you involved in athletics administration come from different personal backgrounds, not to mention a diversity of types of institutions.

But you all have at least one important thing in common. You have devoted yourselves to the success of student-athletes — both on and off the playing field. For this, we thank you.

I know from my work with many in this room that — as we take this time this morning to celebrate the student-athlete — many of you played intercollegiate athletics during your own student days. It seems appropriate

this morning to acknowledge that aspect of student-athletes' influence in Division III.

In fact, I would like to take a moment and ask those of you in the room this morning who played intercollegiate sports at any level — senior or junior college and in any division or organization — to please raise your hands high and let us see you.

Now, will those of you who played sports at a Division III school, please raise your hands. You who have raised your hands are especially appreciated in our tribute this morning. You have applied the lessons you learned from your own campus experience for the benefit and support of today's student-athletes.

We who play the sports today are proud to be part of your tradition, and we look forward to a continuation of that tradition, as some of today's student-athletes take their own places as the administrators and coaches, or more accurately, the educators of the future.

Thank you for your participation this morning and through the coming year in the NCAA's and Division III's celebration of the student-athlete.

OFFICIAL NOTICE AND PROGRAM APPROVAL

Mr. Stone: Thank you, Sameer and Heather.

This Convention marks the beginning of the Centennial Celebration. We will be continuing this series of activities throughout the year. We not only have the celebration going on at the national level as we see here today, but we also know that there are many, many stories to be told on your individual campuses. We urge you to be paying particular attention to those stories and to not only publicize them and make sure the community around you hears those stories, but also to keep in touch with the NCAA staff to let them know of these stories. They are going to be in touch with you during the year to talk to you about how we can network to get these great stories out to celebrate Division III athletics. Please continue the celebration.

I want to call attention to the fact that we have a court reporter. As we start our business session, let me remind you that it is necessary for you to get to a microphone in order to participate. Be sure to give your name and the conference you are in so the court reporter can get that information.

The next formal activity of the business session is to first approve the Official Notice and Convention Program, which will set our agenda and include the appendixes and the noncontroversial legislation. Let me spell out what that means. The Official Notice is the green book that has the legislation in it. The Convention Program is the orange book. It has a couple of corrections of items that are being voted on today. I think they are on Page 14. They will be pointed out to you again when we get to the legislation. They were also pointed out yesterday. I think you will agree that those are not controversial, but they certainly need to be looked at to make sure you have the accurate reading of the legislation. When we vote on the Convention Notice and Program, it establishes our agenda for today and the sequence in which we will vote on the 29 proposals. We will not discuss the appendix items unless you decide to pull one out. To do that, you need to make an appropriate motion and the delegate body will make a decision on whether to pull one out. We will proceed to the rest of the package and then come back and discuss the issue that you want to do separately. We also would expect that if you pull a proposal out for separate treatment and do not approve it, it would be automatically returned to the Management Council for further consideration.

We will ask for a motion to approve the Notice and Program. It will require a second. That will put it in front of us. That's debatable. We can talk about that. While that is pending and before we vote on it, you will have the opportunity to amend that motion to approve the Program and Notice to reorder the voting sequence or to pull out an item for discussion. I would like to ask if there is a motion to approve the Program and Notice.

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: I move that the Program and Notice be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Stone: Is there a motion to reorder the proposals.

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): I move to amend the motion to adopt the Convention Program to reorder Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the New England Small College Athletic Conference, I move to reorder Proposal No. 24 to follow Proposal No. 18 within the Presidents Council grouping of roll-call votes.

We believe that this piece of legislation is a significant student-athlete welfare issue. As such, Proposal No. 24 warrants the attention of the membership. We believe this proposal impacts student-athlete participation opportunities, hence it should be considered when other playing-and practice-season legislation is discussed and voted upon in the roll-call package.

Mr. Stone: This is debatable. It is voted on by a majority vote, and it will require only a paddle vote. Are there others to speak to the motion to reorder Item No. 24? Apparently no one is asking to speak to that.

[The motion to reorder was approved.]

Mr. Stone: I will now ask if there are any other motions to amend our motion to approve the Notice and Program.

Andrea Savage (New England Small College Athletic Conference): I move that Proposal No. 24 be considered for a roll-call vote.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Stone: This was to require Proposal No. 24 that was just moved, by action of the conference to be done by roll-call voting.

[The motion to require a roll-call vote was approved.]

Are there any further amendments? We see no one going to the microphones.

Is there any further discussion on the main motion, as now amended twice, to approve the Program and Notice, which includes the approval of the appendixes that I referred to earlier? This will be paddle voting, and I will ask you to indicate your approval of the amended motion to approve the Notice and Program by raising your paddles if you do approve.

[The motion was approved.]

You have approved your Notice and Program as amended, and you have now adopted the agenda for our work day. We will make the adjustment of the ordering as you have directed.

In a few minutes, we will be addressing the legislative proposals and we will consider our 21 roll-call proposals. That is likely to occupy the entire morning. After lunch we will open the window of reconsideration. Most of you have participated in this to know what we intend by that. Under the parliamentary procedure, you have the right if you voted on the prevailing side of an item with the majority, to change your mind and come back before the Convention closes and say you would like to reconsider it. You have a right to move the proposal and it can be put to the delegate body and rescind the action taken. We will do that after lunch, or after we have completed voting on the 21 items. After the window of reconsideration, we will then proceed to the remaining eight items that we assume will be done by paddle voting. After that, we will have reconsideration of those. Along the way, we have a little bit of business to transact — the election of the Management Council and a couple of other things that we will want to do between those items.

Before we go into the agenda, I would like to recognize some folks who really have done some very important work for us during the year. It is appropriate for us to recognize them.

The first would be the Convention planning subcommittee. I think you can see how much work must go into setting up the Convention, not only by the staff but by our volunteers who serve from our member institutions and do so much work to try to make this a great Convention for us.

I would like for you to stand as I call your name and let us recognize the whole group if you are a member of that Convention planning subcommittee: Sharon Beverly, director of athletics at Vassar College; David Curry, director of athletics at Chapman University; Julie Davis, associate director of athletics at Wheaton College (Illinois); Jone Dowd, senior woman administrator, Catholic University; Richard Flynn, president of Springfield College; Doug Hastad, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Fredina Ingold, director of athletics, Penn State, Altoona; Steve Larson, director of athletics at Edgewood College; Del Mallow, director of athletics at Salve Regina University;

Heather Mathis, student-athlete, Maryville College (Tennessee); Kevin McHugh, executive director, student development of campus programs, College of New Jersey; Mike Miranda, faculty athletics rep from Plattsburgh

State University of New York; James Moseley, president of Franklin College; Dick Rasmussen, executive secretary, University Athletic Association; Sandra Slabik, faculty athletic representative from Neumann College; and Christine Walter, director of athletics, Lasell College.

I would like for us to recognize these hard-working people who serve us. (Applause)

I would like to also thank Management Council and Presidents Council members who really worked hard this year to not only get the legislation ready for you, but also to make other arrangements and carry on much of the work of the NCAA for Division III throughout the year. They worked very hard.

I had a chance to work with both, and I am so impressed with their diligence, faithfulness, commitment and the amount of time they give to the NCAA. I would like to recognize particularly the ones who are going off this year from the Presidents Council: David Carter from Eastern Connecticut State University. We gave David a pass at this Convention because he just got promoted as head of his entire system, and had some activities related to that. We thought it was a little pretentious to take on a promotion when he could be here with us, but he did it and we excused him. Seriously, we do appreciate David's good work. Another outgoing Presidents Council member is David Knobel, president, Denison University. Outgoing Management Council members are: Doug Hastad, chancellor, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Joyce Wong, Eastern Connecticut State University; and Chad Yowell, Wheaton College (Massachusetts). These folks have all finished their terms. I want to express deep appreciation to you for your good service. Thank you. (Applause)

It also is appropriate for us to recognize those people who have been serving as members of the Management Council and the Presidents Council during the year. I would like for them and any person who served on any NCAA committee this year to stand. Look at the representation that we have in this room of people that who have given their time to this organization. Thank you. (Applause)

If you are interested in serving on a committee, you don't have to wait to be drafted. We love to have people speak up and say I am happy to try to help. If I can be of service, please let me do this or that. We will try to find a place for you, because we are delighted to have these good folks working and we need more and more. There is also an online process on the Web page. So please feel free to use that. You can go to the information booth. You can talk to staff. You can talk to any of us who you recognize in the hallway and we will make a note of your name and your interest and try to do something about that.

The last group I would like to recognize would be those of you who have participated through your institutions in hosting championships. Championship activities are a huge piece of what we do at the NCAA. It takes a lot of volunteers to make that happen. If you have hosted an NCAA championship this year, stand and let us recognize you. Again, we have a large crowd. Thank you. (Applause)

As you can see, the organization works through its membership and through its membership it works through volunteer activity. If we put even a minimum wage value on the number of the hours of the volunteers, it would be a horrendous number. We are very grateful for the way you have continued to support your organization.

Now it is time for us to turn to our legislation. Our practice is for the Management Council chair to take us through the legislative proposals. I will have a chance to speak to you again before we finish, but I would like to turn to Mike Miranda, who has done a wonderful job as chair of the Management Council this year. By virtue of that, he also serves on the Presidents Council. Mike will take us through our legislative proposals. Michael.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Michael Miranda (Plattsburgh State University of New York): Thank you, Phil. Good morning, all. This morning we will consider a total of 21 legislative proposals and related amendments should they come. These are proposals that are numbered in your program as Nos. 1 through 20, with the addition of No. 24.

We will vote on those proposals in numerical order, again noting that Proposal 24 has been moved to follow Proposal No. 18. Please remember that there are editorial corrections appearing in the Convention Program, and we will make note of those corrections as we work through the process.

There is also an important document that has been provided to you in a number of different forms — the question-and-answer document that can help to answer some questions as we work our way through the agenda.

We also have experts on these various issues — the staff and the sponsors of the proposals — who will be able to answer any questions as we proceed.

Just as we did during yesterday's forum, we will attempt to call your attention to any of this information as we proceed. If you do feel that we have missed something, please don't hesitate to let us know. It is possible that some of the proposals will be withdrawn as we proceed and obviously that will be mentioned from the floor and we will take that action under consideration as we move through the process. You will need both your voting paddles and the electronic voting unit today for various votes on the different issues. Our procedures dictate that all votes will be done either by paddle or electronically rather than by voice or by hand.

Proposals Nos. 1 through 20 make up the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with those proposals with the addition of No. 24, and conduct electronic votes for those proposals and any motions related to them. We will use the wireless voting units to cast our roll-call vote.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

As we begin, I would like to remind you of a couple of other points of order. For the benefit of the court reporter, please state your name and institution when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones. Please remember that the delegates are limited to addressing each proposal twice, not counting answering questions directly posed to them by other delegates. Finally, the issue of calling the question is something we need to be mindful of. We want to have a full and open discussion on these issues. I don't think we want to have people making speeches and then moving to limit debate after they have had the last word.

One of the responsibilities of the chair of the Management Council is to write a brief column for the Division III newsletter. In one of my first attempts at that, I focused on the Division III philosophy and how its interpretation and application on campus is essential to all that we do. It is noteworthy that virtually any discussions we have had on any of the proposed legislation takes into account the merits of that particular proposal and how it can invoke the philosophy in one way or another. I believe this is indicative of a strong and vital document, but it should also serve to remind us all that the proposition of legislation — whether we support that proposal or not — is done within the context of our central mission to provide a framework within which student-athletes have the opportunity to excel in all aspects of the intercollegiate experience. We should also be mindful to never permit disagreements on issues to devolve into distrust of each other. Reasonable people can disagree reasonably. We should, I believe, refrain from imputing motives and allowing our perceptions of others' motivation to cloud the discourse. Disagreement should never turn to distrust; rather, a lively debate on the issues and the underlying philosophy of the division is a healthy and important function, and that is what has brought us all here today.

I think at this point we are ready to turn to the consideration of the presidential legislative package and Proposal No. 1.

AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Richard Wells (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal amends Bylaw 12.5.1, which pertains to student-athletes' involvement in promotional activities. As we all know, a student-athlete cannot endorse a commercial product, and this proposal does not change that.

It does add flexibility to the current limits and a prohibition against promotional partners that sell alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, performance-enhancing drugs or organizations that promote gambling. The proposal is put forward because of the technological advances that have increased the opportunities for multi-media promotions.

Current legislation has hindered the manner in which institutions can partner with commercial entities to advance initiatives such as the educational mission and the value of the student-athlete experience. This proposal would increase an institution's flexibility to engage in various types of promotions, while maintaining the current restrictions on the types of entities — those being institutional, charitable, educational and nonprofit agen-

cies — that may use the name or appearance of a student-athlete.

This proposal requires the institution's chancellor or president, or his or her designee, to approve the promotional activities the student-athletes are participating in. The expectation is that the chancellor or president will oversee the activities to ensure the obligation to protect the student-athlete from exploitation. It is balanced with the institution's need to enhance the mutual benefits derived from a relationship with corporate entities. This proposal limits the appearance or description of commercial products, services or logos to 25 percent of the total promotional activity to ensure the commercial focus of the promotion is not excessive.

Finally, the principle of amateurism is sustained because the student-athlete is still precluded from endorsing the use of a product. For these reasons, I urge you support this proposal.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 1.

Proposal No. 1 attempts to provide guidance for the type of permissible promotions a student-athlete may be involved with and introduce the opportunity for a commercial sponsor to display a product in a promotion as long as that promotion remains primarily devoted to the educational or nonprofit entity.

Under the current rule, a student-athlete may participate in a promotional activity if it is for an institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit entity. This proposal does not change the permissible promotional entities. So for example, it would still be permissible for a student-athlete to be involved with a cancer awareness walk.

What this proposal changes is the types of identification that the commercial entity could use as a co-sponsor of the promotion. For example, if the restaurant was a co-sponsor of the cancer awareness walk and posters were being created to get people to attend, currently it could only have its name and its trademark on a poster. Under this proposal, the restaurant could have a picture of their meal or building.

In addition, under the current rule, the restaurant logo could take up the entire poster. Under this proposal, the logo or trademark or any images of the commercial product, is limited to 25 percent of the poster. This limitation helps to ensure that this is truly a promotion for a charitable event and not a commercial for the restaurant.

Lastly, under the current rule, there does not have to be any explanation that the restaurant is a co-sponsor of the event. This proposal requires that the co-sponsor must be identified as such, meaning the poster must indicate that the restaurant is simply a co-sponsor of the cancer awareness walk.

Please remember that this proposal still vests the institution with the authority to determine the type of promotional activities with which student-athletes are involved. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 1 was adopted, 400-6-0.]

RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — EXCEPTION

Mr. Miranda: Proposal No. 2 was discussed in yesterday's forum. There is an editorial correction that appears in the Program. Please be aware of that.

Richard Flynn (Springfield College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2.
[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 2 serves as an exception to the tryout rule by allowing a coach in a specified sport to conduct a private one-on-one lesson in the coach's sport with the prospective student-athlete.

This proposal would allow Division III coaches an additional income stream beyond their coaching salaries. Allowing these individuals to teach private lessons will benefit the coach as well as the community served by these sport experts.

Controls established by the proposal — such as requiring that lessons are made available to the general public, that these prospects are commensurate with those charged to all individuals, and that the athletics director must approve the coach's offering of lessons to prospects — alleviate concerns that the lessons will be used to circumvent the principles behind the Division III tryout prohibition.

The Presidents Council supports Proposal No. 2 and I urge you to do the same.

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 2.

Proposal No. 2 will aid in the development of young athletes because they will have increased access to high-quality instructors who also happen to serve as Division III coaches.

Lessons by an expert will benefit young athletes and will allow institutional coaches to be more connected to the community. This proposal allows our coaching community the same opportunities available to music instructors when they offer one-on-one lessons or when our math instructors offer private tutoring to high-school students. Just as these campus experts are allowed to offer lessons, and in many cases are encouraged to offer lessons to provide a service to their communities, so, too, should our coaches. Please support Proposal No. 2. Thank you.

John Schael (Washington University in St. Louis): I'll ask the question I asked yesterday. I kept on hearing one-on-one in terms of teaching a lesson.

When I look at the question-and-answer paper, it says private lessons are geared primarily for one-on-one. It doesn't say it is a one-on-one deal. Can we get a clarification?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): I think in the majority of the cases, a private lesson is one-on-one instruction. I think that particular document was written in that way because we couldn't envision every single case where there may be an opportunity to have potentially something different than a one-on-one lesson.

I know we addressed the question yesterday regarding five members of a basketball team, and that clearly is going beyond a private lesson. It is more of a team instruction. So I would still use the language, generally speaking, that this is a one-on-one lesson, because we are not able to envision every possible scenario.

Mr. Schael: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 2 was adopted, 313-85-6.]

ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Don Tencher (Rhode Island College): I move Proposal No. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe there is a touch of irony that there are so many negative events that surround this legislation so widely supported by student-athletes as we conduct our business under the theme of Celebrating the Student-Athlete. There is an endorsement of our student-athletes' opinions, so I urge your support of this proposal.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): As a member and on behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

The rationale statement of this proposal states that the ability to redshirt has a positive impact on academic success and student-athlete well-being. In fact, the elimination of redshirting encourages degree completion in a four-year time frame and eliminates the pressure imposed on student-athletes to prolong the time they spend at our institution.

Just as most Division III educational programs are designed to last four years, so should Division III athletics participation. This legislation also is not necessary. Current legislation provides for additional participation opportunities when a student-athlete misses a traditional segment due to legitimate academic reasons, like studying abroad or student teaching. I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Albert Bean (University of Southern Maine): For years, we have been told that the diversity of this division is one of its strengths. In fact, there are a number of us who are from public institutions. Part of our mission is access.

Our student body is somewhat different than other institutions. If we are all to work together, we have to support each other in what our missions are. It has been said if you support this, that you may not support reform, that you may not support academics. That's simply untrue.

I think everybody in this room supports reform in academics. This is really an issue about competitive equity. There is fear. There is mistrust that people will abuse the redshirt rule. That is a different issue in my mind than whether or not we should remove, as we already have, a very important tool to support student-athlete well-being and success.

With all due respect, I think we need to get this right for students and to get it right for students from every kind of institution in this very diverse membership. I think this is a critical issue. This is not about how many weeks are right or how many games are right. This hits more at the philosophy of supporting our students. Thank you.

Dennis Leighton (University of New England): As president-elect of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 3.

The practice of redshirting was eliminated in 2004. The Faculty Athletics Representatives Association does not recommend that measures taken only two years ago as part of the reform agenda should be changed after only two years of practice. It is too early to fully determine the positive and negative effects of the reform agenda.

The rationale statement for this proposal states that the faculty's voice should be heard. Therefore, I stand representing Division III faculty in opposition to Proposal No. 3.

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal. The current season of participation standard re-affirms the Division III philosophy by establishing an appropriate balance between academics and athletics.

Athletics should be just one part of the overall experience that a student experiences at a Division III institution. A student-athlete who participates fully in practice is a member of the team and should be treated that way for eligibility purposes. The four-year athletics standard and experience should be what we have at Division III for our student-athletes. This also helps distinguish us from Division I and Division II. For these reasons, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): I am here to support those sponsors of this proposal to correct an inequity for many of our student-athletes.

It is difficult for us to take away the term "redshirting." Obviously, it has a negative connotation to it. But in many instances, this is not redshirting. Certainly, there are a number of individuals — an increasing number — who take more than the traditional four years to complete their degree requirements.

Yesterday, I raised the issue that this proposal provides an equitable opportunity for our fall student-athletes who return to campus after practices and tryouts have already begun to display their skills. There are other individuals, for varying reasons, whose connection with a team certainly would be a benefit for them from an academic standpoint. When we look at the reform measures, I think some folks look at them as the Bill of Rights or the Ten Commandments or the Koran or the Rosetta Stone. It is not that.

In some instances, reforms need to be reformed. In this case, this proposal is one that needs to be approved for those student-athletes who it certainly would benefit to be involved with an athletics program for the entire academic year.

Steven Suggs (Stevens Institute of Technology): I am a lacrosse student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 3.

The committee recognizes that this issue has come full circle. We continue to support the idea of allowing student-athletes the opportunity to align their academic and athletics experiences. A student-athlete enrolled in a plan of study requiring more than four years should be able to maintain their team chemistry, keep up with their academics and plan their collegiate experience without the pressure of scheduling around their seasons of eligibility.

This proposal does not encourage student-athletes to extend their scholastic careers, but rather encourages and gives them the opportunity to plan their academic and athletics paths with their best interest in mind. Thank you.

Ken Jones [St. John's University (Minnesota)]: In this division, we talk a lot about making sure that our student-athletes are treated like their peers who are not engaged in intercollegiate athletics. Redshirting works against this by encouraging student-athletes to delay their graduation for purely athletics reasons.

We don't tell first-year flutists that they are not quite good enough to play in concerts, but if they are willing to practice with the band their first year, there is a good chance they can get in four years of concerts if they stay in school for an extra year. If we don't do this for flutists and trumpeters, why would we do it for fullbacks and tackles?

I am also opposed to redshirting because it puts us in what seems to me to be a pretentious ethical condition.

Redshirting exploits the very understandable hope of young people that if they hang around long enough they can become key players and help the team win. We dangle this prospect in front of them and —oh, by the way — ask them to fork over the money for an unnecessary semester or year's tuition. I am afraid that some people might see this as a rather suspicious way of enhancing revenue.

Marcus Pryor (College of Mount St. Joseph): I am a football student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 3.

It has been stated that a four-year athletics experience should be sufficient for Division III student-athletes. Clearly, our presidents support the Division III philosophy, which treats students and student-athletes the same. If this is true, we ask why would a student with an interest in drama have the opportunity to participate in the university play for five years if he or she should choose to do so? Again, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 3. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 3 was defeated, 277-128-1.]

ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION — PARTICIPATION AT ANY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

Chris Graham (Midwest Conference): On behalf of the 10 member institutions of the Midwest Conference and our faculty athletics representatives, I move Proposal No. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposal to charge a season of eligibility to a student-athlete at an intercollegiate institution based on Bylaw 14.2.4.1 intends to address the disparities between Divisions I and II transfers and our own student-athletes.

This discussion and consideration is a necessary step after the adoption of Proposal 57 at the 2004 Convention, and now more importantly because of the defeat of Proposal No. 3 just a few moments ago. Currently, we are affording something to a transfer from outside of Division III that is not available to student-athletes on our own campuses — an additional year of participation by the Division III standard.

Student-athletes who make the initial decision to participate out of Divisions I or II institutions are generally basing that decision on athletics. If it doesn't work, we are currently saying they should be rewarded in Division III by honoring the return of that year, something not available to our student-athletes except through hardship waivers. Those who believe this unfairly penalizes the transfer from outside of Division III who was misled by coaches or had visions of grandeur need to consider that our own student-athletes have no recourse against the same circumstances within Division III.

If a prospect matriculates to a Division III institution based on the comments of a coach or on an impression they can make the team and compete immediately or through the course of a season and things drastically change, that student-athlete cannot redeem that season. Some may argue that the decision to redshirt is not the student-athlete's but the coach's, and for that they should not be penalized. The decision to attend that institution outside of Division III with redshirting, the clear possibility is within the student-athlete's decision-making opportunities.

Unfortunately, students are not redshirted so they can concentrate on their academics at Divisions I or II schools. They are redshirted because there is a lack of roster spots and/or the talent level does not meet certain standards. We should not endorse that type of decision-making by rewarding a transfer the opportunity to retain that year.

Because no data exist in regard to transfers among NCAA institutions, we cannot say for certain how many student-athletes would be affected annually by this proposed legislation. It seems safe to say that it is not a large number, which should have us asking ourselves why shouldn't we re-affirm and promote the Division III stance on a season of participation when so few individuals are affected?

That is what we have been trying to accomplish these last three years — a stronger dedication toward principles and beliefs that greatly outweigh some of the smaller consequences of our actions. No argument can be more compelling in this case than the one that has us protecting the valuable four-year limits we impose upon our own student-athletes.

Nothing will prohibit the transfer into Division III from having as many as three productive years of compe-

tition while adapting their academic pursuits and working toward completion of a degree at our fine institutions. Even if it means remaining in school an additional year beyond participation, our institution and the student-athlete are all better off in the long run. We urge your support for this proposal.

James Moseley (Franklin College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

This proposal appropriately applies a consistent standard to all Division III student-athletes, including those who participated previously at a non-Division III institution. A student-athlete's decision to transfer to a Division III school should not be based upon regaining lost participation opportunities, but rather upon the unique academic benefits and campus environment that exists at a Division III school. This proposal ensures that all Division III student-athletes are treated fairly and consistently and that transfer decisions are made for reasons other than athletics opportunities.

Kevin McHugh (The College of New Jersey): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 4.

Currently, student-athletes who do not attend Division III schools are permitted to retain a year of competition by redshirting, even if they later transfer to a Division III school. With this proposal, the student-athlete becomes accountable for the prior decision to redshirt when he or she attends a Division III institution. Further, this proposal strengthens the Division III commitment to the four-year athletics experience. It applies a consistent participation standard to all Division III student-athletes regardless of previous participation at a non-Division III school. I urge you to support Proposal No. 4. Thank you.

Laura Barshefsky (Russell Sage College): I am a soccer student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 4. This proposal is inconsistent with the Division III philosophy because it penalizes student-athletes wishing to transfer from Divisions I or II to Division III.

Under this proposal, a student-athlete who redshirted at a Division I or Division II institution and wished to transfer to a Division III institution would be penalized one year of eligibility. This threat would force that student-athlete to consider his or her athletics standing as a deciding factor in the rationale for transferring. It is unfair to hold a student-athlete accountable for a rule that was not applicable at the division he or she originally attended. We encourage you to oppose Proposal No. 4. Thank you.

Paul Grauer (Augsburg College): I speak in opposition to this proposal. I base that opposition on the philosophical positions that one can take on this. On the one hand, you have the concept of consistency. In our conference, we have a rule that does restrict a person from using a year coming from a Division I or Division II school. So I am very familiar with that concept.

However, for that reason, Augsburg College will not benefit in any way, shape or form by opposing this proposal. I speak on behalf of those individuals who have not heard of this legislation, who are attending or may attend a Division I or Division II school, where they are told by the coach what they are going to do. What they are expected to do, if this passes, is to give up something that is incredibly precious to them.

I think all of us would agree that being able to compete is a very, very precious thing. They will be giving that up if they decide they want to have a Division III experience. Some people say we hear all about this mistake that someone makes. You can call it a mistake. You can call it a change of mind. As human beings, we do change our mind as we go through life. I think that is a good quality to have. A student-athlete who has gone to a Division I or Division II school and decides to transfer to Division III thinks that they have something very precious — that year of competition. When they start looking into the transfer possibilities to Division III, if we pass this, they will become aware there has been an irreversible decision made a year or two before that will affect their eligibility very, very negatively.

I think it is quite appropriate that the SAAC, the national organization, opposes this, because they are empathetic to other student-athletes who would find themselves in this position. I strongly oppose this legislation, and I hope you will, too. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 4 was defeated, 203-199-4.]

ELIGIBILITY — GRADUATE STUDENT/POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION — EXCEPTION

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I move Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Yesterday during the issues forum, we heard of the sponsors' intent to withdraw this proposal because after further consideration they realized there were a number of unresolved issues and potential unintended consequences over the adoption of legislation in this regard. We also heard of an attempt to refer decisions about the participation of graduate students on campuses other than their undergraduate campus to the administrative review process. However, there was no fully articulated statement regarding the basis on which granting such waivers would be accomplished.

During our conference meetings yesterday, our members also expressed these sorts of reservations, and we generally oppose this legislation. Even though given the scope of our graduate programs, we potentially in one regard might be the beneficiaries of the adoption of legislation like this. Also, we noted that in recent Conventions, the membership defeated a similar proposal that would have allowed graduate students to participate on campuses other than their undergraduate institution. Therefore, on behalf of the members of the University Athletic Association, I would like to move to refer this proposal to the Management Council for further review and refinement in order to bring this legislation back to the membership to determine whether this line should be crossed at all; or, if the alternative is to develop a very narrowly tailored set of criterion on which such waivers would be granted, particularly in the absence of any established precedent with regard to this issue.

Mr. Miranda: We have before us a motion to refer. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Miranda: There is a second. The motion is debatable. Is there anyone who would care to discuss the merits of referring this to the Management Council? Seeing no one moving to the microphone, we will vote now on the motion to refer this to the Management Council.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 5 to the Management Council was approved, 367-33-6.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP — MINIMUM CONTEST REQUIREMENTS

Rick Wells (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

The focus of this proposal is to provide meaningful sports sponsorship for Division III programs. In order for an institution to use the sport to fulfill sports sponsorship requirements, it should demonstrate a legitimate commitment to that sport program.

The number of contests conducted in that sport should represent legitimate sponsorship for a quality student-athlete experience. To further this goal, Proposal No. 6 revises the minimum contests requirements for sports sponsorship to 70 percent of the division-wide average number of completed contests. The contest numbers in this proposal reflect the most recent data available. They are based on completed contests during the years 2001-02 through 2003-04. With this proposal, the Membership Committee will review average contest figures every three years and update the minimum contest requirement based on that review.

The committee does not plan to re-calibrate the minimums at 70 percent of the average every three years, but rather plans to propose adjustments only if trends indicate that it is necessary and appropriate. The proposal originated with the study of the future of Division III and its emphasis on sports sponsorship issues.

The delayed effective date of August 1, 2007, will give institutions one year to adjust contest schedules. Please support Proposal No. 6. Thank you.

Richard Strockbine (University of Dallas): As a member of the Division III Management Council and the Division III Membership Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 6.

Historically, some sports have had low minimal contest requirements. This proposal represents an effort to

link contest requirements to current practices in the division. As a result, some sport minimums will increase significantly. Without a sufficient number of contests, an institution does not demonstrate a true commitment to the sport and consequently does not demonstrate a commitment to a quality student-athlete experience.

Proposal 6 replaces the prior piecemeal establishment of minimum-contest requirements, and instead uses the figure of 70 percent of the division-wide average number of completed contests. The Division III Membership Committee arrived at the minimums in this proposal by using data submitted by institutions through the NCAA sports sponsorship report.

An emerging sport is excluded from the proposal because of low sponsorship levels. Where necessary, downward adjustments have been made in selected sports to ensure consistency between men's and women's minimums in those sports. I urge you to support Proposal No. 6.

[Proposal No. 6 was approved, 318-84-2.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT

Douglas Bennett (Earlham College): On behalf of the members of the North Coast Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

Participation is at the heart of the Division III philosophy. This proposal affirms and supports broad participation in intercollegiate athletics. We are not a division that believes in a handful playing and many watching. We are a division that believes in intercollegiate athletics for many and that provides a broad opportunity for students to participate in athletics. That philosophy can only be affirmed by offering a broad array of sports for the multitude of talents and interests that our students bring to us.

The proposal is simpler than it may seem. For coeducational institutions with enrollments greater than 1,400, it would require sponsorship of 14 sports. For smaller institutions, it would require fewer. For institutions with an enrollment of less than 1,100, it would require a sponsorship of no more than the 10 sports currently required. Note that the current sponsorship average in the division is more than 16.

This proposal affirms an important commonality, one grounded in the Division III philosophy — broad participation in athletics. Thank you.

Peggy Williams (Ithaca College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 7.

This proposal seeks to increase the required number of sports sponsored to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from 10 to 14 based on institutional enrollment. While the Presidents Council favors maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for students and enhancing the division's commitment to offering broad-based programs, a more manageable approach is presented in Proposal No. 8, where no institution will be required to add more than one sport per gender, nor exceed 12 sports in total.

For these reasons, and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 7.

Jeff Ankrom (Wittenberg University): I rise to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7.

Proposal No. 7 is both flexible and it is reasonable. It is flexible because it incorporates a sliding scale that recognizes the relationship between enrollments and sports sponsorship levels. It is reasonable because it incorporates a waiver process and it does not impose an undue burden on our membership.

Let me remind you that only 30 schools will be affected with enrollments over 1,400 by the proposed legislation. It also exempts small schools with enrollments under 1,100 and is in one sense less burdensome than the following proposal.

Fifty-five percent of our membership has enrollment levels between 1,400 and 2,500. Twenty-two percent of our membership has enrollment levels of more than 2,500. So three-fourths-more than 300 institutions in our division have enrollments of more than 1,400, and only a small number are affected by this legislation.

As the previous speaker mentioned, the average level of sports sponsorship in Division III is almost 17. Proposal No. 7 is flexible and reasonable. I encourage the membership to support and vote for No. 7.

Larry Lee (Allegheny College): I hear more and more often in discussions with my colleagues that the dis-

similarity of our overall membership is trying to impact our ability to provide the best possible experiences for our students.

It is easy to understand why institutions that sponsor the minimum number of sports might share a very different legislative agenda than other institutions with much larger athletics offerings. This disparity has made passing legislation that is in the best interest of our programs to be increasingly difficult. This proposal takes steps to lessen the current disparity in sports sponsorship, and it enables our membership to better practice the Division III philosophy of encouraging participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunity for the students. I strongly urge you to support Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

Alison Schmidt (College of Wooster): As we look to our future in Division III, we need to stand up for the majority of our members who are already making the real commitment to a broad-based athletics program. With passage of this proposal, a very small group of our members may have to add one or two sports to approach the commitment most of our institutions are already making. It will pay off for the institution and for our division in the long run with a more compatible playing division. Let's strive for a higher standard in Division III. Please vote for this proposal. Thank you.

Joyce Wong (Eastern Connecticut State University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 7.

While this proposal has the noble goal of increased athletics opportunities for students, the financial and logistical issues related to fluctuating enrollment by small institutions presented by this proposal may place a burden on some of our institutions.

Proposal No. 8 strikes a better balance between the broad-based program philosophy and the resources of some Division III institutions. Therefore, the Councils prefer Proposal No. 8, and we request the defeat of Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

Tom Chema (Hiram College): We are one of the smaller schools in the North Coast Athletic Conference, and we fully support Proposal No. 7.

We think it is extremely important that all of us expend our efforts to maximize the student-athletic experience. By proposing and approving this legislation, all schools will have the opportunity to do this. This particular proposal provides a great amount of flexibility, various exemptions and a time frame that allows for compliance. I urge your support of this proposal.

Meghan Lockard (Gettysburg College): I am a tennis and swimming student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 7. This proposal suggests a structure where increased enrollment requires an additional sport for 100 students. The committee argues that it is unreasonable to assume that all undergraduate students have an interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics. It would be even more unrealistic to believe that most of the male or female student-athletes sharing interest in the same sport could therefore form an intercollegiate athletics team.

With the defeat of this proposal, larger institutions would still have the choice to add sports while maintaining its autonomy. Also, smaller institutions would not struggle to comply. Furthermore, this proposal does not account for the diversity of the Division III student population. Again, we encourage you to oppose Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

Susan Phillips Speece (Penn State Berks College): On behalf of the Northeastern Athletic Conference presidents, athletics directors and commissioner, we would like to speak against this proposal.

When you look at the economy in the United States for the last four or five years, you know that each institution has been profoundly affected in a negative sense. State legislators have resisted providing funds for institutions. Donors have been looking after their own interests.

If you looked at the electronic version of the Chronicle of Higher Education this morning, you will see that state legislators have finally begun to shift around. But to ask institutions to increase sports sponsorship by either 20 or 40 percent as this proposal would suggest has significant financial impact on those institutions that will be affected.

I applaud the students' comments because I think they understand the diversity of campuses and student populations. Please vote against this position.

[Proposal No. 7 was defeated, 371-37-3.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT — SIX SPORTS FOR MALES/MIXED AND FEMALE TEAMS

Richard Flynn (Springfield College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would require institutions with full-time enrollment of more than 1,000 students to sponsor six sports per gender. Accordingly, it does require the addition of sports for approximately 20 member institution.

A core tenet of Division III is a broad-based sports program. A Division III institution should seek to include a significant portion of its student body in its athletics program. That is why this new sponsorship level is tied into institutional enrollment.

However, the proposal does provide an exception for the approximately 25 percent of Division III schools with undergraduate enrollment of less than 1,000. Exempting those schools recognizes that enrollment is an important factor in determining what constitutes a broad-based program. A four-year delayed effective date will give each school that would currently be affected by this proposal adequate time to prepare for its implementation. It is similar to the delayed effective date successfully employed when minimums were raised last year, or were raised last from four and four to five and five.

It should be noted that the current sports sponsorship waivers will remain available to provide additional relief to institutions when unique circumstances warrant such action. I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 8. Thank you.

Chad Yowell [Wheaton College (Massachusetts)]: As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 8.

This proposal increases the required number of sports an institution must sponsor to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from five to six per gender for institutions with enrollments greater than 1,000 students.

Institutional enrollment for sports sponsorship requirements is based on a rolling four-year average using the full-time undergraduate enrollment figure submitted for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, the EADA. The institution shall sponsor the required number of sports the academic year following the October EADA submission.

The EADA number includes undergraduate fall enrollment figures for full-time baccalaureate and degree-seeking students by gender. Sports sponsorship is a direct reflection of an institution's commitment to the Division III philosophy of encouraging participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for students.

This was an area under review in the study of the future of Division III. Increasing minimum sports sponsorship numbers to six sports for males or mixed teams and six sports for female teams is more reflective of the division-wide average commitment of eight sports per gender. I ask your support for Proposal No. 8. Thank you.

Susan Phillips Speece (Penn State Berks College): On behalf of the presidents, athletics directors and commissioner of the North Eastern Athletic Conference, we speak against this proposal.

Considering the national economy, when you are looking at a 20-percent increase in sports sponsorship, that means that something else in the institution has to give. The funds in institutions have not increased, yet you are asking for an increased financial commitment. We would ask that you reconsider that and vote against that.

Additionally, most of the smaller schools between the 1,000 and 2,000 level have student involvement greater than 14 percent. In fact, many times they have 30-percent student involvement in athletics. A 20-percent increase means 36 percent of the student population would have to participate, and that becomes a very untenable number. We encourage you to vote against this position.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): I rise in opposition to this proposal. Just as the previous proposal was defeated due to enrollment, the population size of an institution certainly is not the only factor for many of those institutions that will be affected by passage of this legislation in terms of their sponsorship of sports.

Other factors include a school's location, available resources, fields, gymnasiums and ice hockey rinks. There

are a number of city institutions that are not privileged to have those as part of their campus. We certainly salute those institutions that can provide a broad-based program. We are not envious of those programs. We are proud to be members of the NCAA and are proud of the inclusiveness of the NCAA. We know that our student populations, as was so correctly pointed out by our student-athlete speaker, have varied interests.

Sixty such clubs are on our campus. Not all students, as we would like to think, are willing or desire to be on an athletics team. There are so many competing interests in terms of being in a big city for our students to share their times and experience.

I know that it may be a circumstance where our previous proposal was defeated and to say I defeated the other one, let me pass this one. Again, it may not affect many of you, but there is significant difficulty for us to fall into that category. My legendary hero, Don Quixote, waving at windmills, I wish to do the same on behalf of this proposal. Thank you.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): I rise to support this proposal. I also would like to support the thoughts of the previous speaker. We certainly think the Council has done a good job in this proposal in trying to make it as flexible as they can for each and every member.

I think it is important to remember that 410 of our members would meet this proposal, 20 would not. I think that says something right there about commitment. It is a logical step in the right direction to link the Division III philosophy with the actual practice of the vast majority of our members. I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 9 was adopted, 233-170-5.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT — INTEGRATION OF ADMINISTRATION — ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE — ADMISSION POLICIES

Douglas Hastad (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal reflects the Division III membership's feedback regarding the integration of student-athletes and athletics administrators into the campus community and culture.

It notes that coaches play a significant role as educators, that the student-athlete's academic performance should be at a minimum consistent with that of the general student body and that admissions policies and procedures for student-athletes should be consistent with those applicable to the general student body.

This proposal answers many of the issues raised in the 2004 Resolution 66. The philosophy statement should reflect the goals and directions that the Division III membership wishes to take. This proposal is presented to the membership as a result of the governance structure's work prescribed in Resolution 66. Support of Proposal 9 will better define significant values to be shared in the future in Division III. Thank you.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 9. This proposal amends the Division III philosophy statement and emphasizes that student-athletes should be fully integrated into the campus culture.

In the 2004 membership survey, 100 percent of the membership responded in support of the current philosophy of placing the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. Further, approximately 90 percent of the respondents indicated that this philosophy should be addressed at the institutional level, a point reinforced by this proposal.

The philosophy statement is not like other bylaws that have related enforcement provisions. There are no penalties for failing to abide by the principles contained in the philosophy statement, rather the philosophy statement serves as a guide for Division III institutions, committees and Councils in making policy decisions. In line with the results of the membership response to the 2004 survey, I urge you to support Proposal No. 9. Thank you.

Tony Ladd [Wheaton College (Illinois)]: I rise to support Proposal No. 9. This proposal clearly articulates the value of athletics within the context of an integrated academic framework of our individual campuses.

Each of our 400-plus institutions represented in Division III has varied missions and approaches to higher

education. I applaud the Presidents Council and the Management Council for acknowledging this diversity, while at the same time identifying the need for a central focus on each campus to provide education within the context of that mission.

On behalf of those of us in the CCIW and throughout the nation who have worked hard for an explicit statement identifying the value of an integrated model of higher education with a coach identified as a key educator within the liberal arts context, I urge support of Proposal No. 9.

Gillian Gremmels (Wartburg College): Today I am representing the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, which strongly supports this proposal and believes that the addition of language in the philosophy statement affirming the importance of academics should strengthen each institution's commitment to the student and the student-athlete. We would further note the high level of support for such statements in the 2004 membership survey. We encourage the delegates to vote yes on this measure. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 9 was adopted 403-2-1.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT — ELIMINATION OF IN-REGION COMPETITION EMPHASIS

Chris Martin (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin): I speak on Proposal No. 10, which eliminates the emphasis on in-region competition, is co-sponsored by the CCIW, along with the University Athletic Association and the Northwest Conference.

While inaccurately labeled as anti-reform, our proposal simply attempts to indicate that the consideration of teams for championship play should be based on the idea that any game against the Division III schools should be counted regardless of where the schools are located or the game is played.

Further, institutional autonomy relating to scheduling and competition should be reflected in the Division III philosophy statement. Finally, as outlined in the proposal's rationale, there are a number of other reasons why we believe this proposal is necessary and appropriate.

Recent changes relating to games played on holiday breaks and the 200-mile radius extension adopted by the Championships Committee and governance structure, indicate support for further consideration in the review of the emphasis on in-region competition.

We applaud those changes and encourage the committee to continue its review. We are committed to further study of this issue and are willing to do so in consultation with the committee and governance structure noting that future legislation may be appropriate. At this time, we would like to withdraw Proposal No. 10 from consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you, Chris. The proposal has been withdrawn by the sponsors of the proposal. It is open to be moved by someone from the floor if they so choose. Seeing no one coming to the microphone to do such, Proposal No. 10 is withdrawn.

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION — MAXIMUM SIZE OF CHAMPIONSHIPS FIELDS

David Beckley (Rust College): As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

In recognition of the growth of the division, this proposal caps championship brackets for team sports at 64 teams. The membership and governance structure have strongly supported a three-week limitation on championships competition for all sports with the exception of football.

To minimize missed class time and maximize time allowed for regular-season competition, this proposal continues to support those concepts by legislating a practical cap on bracket size while maintaining a 1 to 6.5 access ratio before reaching the cap. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support adoption of Proposal No. 11.

Kevin McHugh (The College of New Jersey): As a member of the Management Council, I speak in sup-

port of Proposal No. 11. Establishing a maximum bracket size of 64 for team sports other than football will allow the Championships Committee and the sports committees to appropriately plan for the future.

A 64-team bracket can be conducted in the current three-week championship format. In fact, at current sponsorship levels, a large number of sports have room for growth within the 64-team bracket format. Establishing the 64-team bracket will have the effect in the higher-sponsored sports to ultimately eliminate all byes and create a balanced bracket for the sports that recently moved to multi-team preliminary round sites, such as men's and women's soccer and basketball.

This should eliminate the need for mid-week games and having byes in only some regions, thus creating a more competitive playing field for the entire bracket. On behalf of the Management Council, I urge you to support adoption of Proposal No. 11. Thank you.

Daniel Fulks (Transylvania University): I am a member of the executive committee of the Faculty Athletics Representative Association. On behalf of the association, I would like to strongly support this proposal.

The FAR association believes this proposal decreases participation time and increases time for academics and is in keeping with the Division III philosophy. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 11 was adopted, 391-20-0.]

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — MAXIMUM CAPACITY

Stan Hales (College of Wooster): I am the past president of the North Coast Athletic Conference. On behalf of the 10 members of the North Coast Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Since its inception in 1973, Division III has experienced unprecedented growth from 243 members to more than 450. Thus, it is the largest division by far in NCAA history. It is larger than the entire NAIA membership of 335. It is not far from the size of the entire NCAA when the need to split into divisions was finally acknowledged.

The number of conferences has likewise increased from 30 to 44 in just the last seven years, dramatically changing the playing field for NCAA championships. This growth has already led to two concerned responses at leadership levels. In October, the Presidents Council established a membership moratorium, the third such moratorium Division III has enacted in the last 10 years. Just now, the Championships Committee and the Presidents Council offered Proposal 11 to cap championship fields at 64 teams.

We supported these needed measures, but they are an obvious sign that something is dramatically wrong. Our proposal addresses what is wrong. It addresses the fundamental question for our future of how large a membership do we want. We believe that our proposal to place a permanent cap on the size of Division III deals with three major issues: finances, practical issues of access and the more philosophical issues of governance.

First, the growth to an even higher number of members and conferences would unduly strain the limited resources of staff and funding and would thus create a need for more staff to support current services. Yet, whether we are 400, 500 or 600, our percentage share of revenue is fixed by the Association's formula and is out of our control. A cap is necessary to stabilize and protect the current levels of NCAA staff services and preserve the value of our share of the Association's revenue.

Second is the practical matter of access to championships. Uncapped growth unavoidably would lead either to a decline in access for all of us or extend playoffs further into the academic year when already that infringement is substantial and widely judged to be unacceptable.

Finally, in the area of governance, we already see at these meetings the challenge of legislating equitably given the wide range of institutional missions, the wide range of philosophies and even admissions practices in the division.

It is hard to see us getting better with a large influx of members from the NAIA and from Divisions I and II. For all these reasons, myself and all of my NCAA colleagues urge your support of this proposal, which is important for each of us as individual members and also for sensible management and competition in Division III as a whole.

Vernon Mummert (Wabash College): I rise in support of a permanent membership cap for Division III.

A vote for this cap proposal is a vote for your coaches, your student-athletes and your institution. A vote against this cap proposal is a vote against your coaches, your student-athletes and your institution. As a director of athletics, I am very concerned about a possible failure to act on this issue today.

The handwriting is already on the wall. We have grown from 243 members in 1973 to a current membership of 437 active and provisional members. In the last 10 years alone, we have enacted three moratoriums to delay membership growth. Why delay when the immediate need for passage is self-evident?

Further study of this Division III membership cap for our colleagues in Division I and Division II is not necessary. Having this Division III body approve a Division III resolution with this cap proposal is imperative. We have had a Presidents Council proposal before us today that addresses our growth and states that we need to cap our championship tournament fields at 64. We agree.

With unlimited membership growth in Division III, how many weeks will our championships run? Five weeks, six weeks, seven weeks? Size does and will matter. We have a problem that we can no longer ignore in Division III. A “yes” vote today for the Division III membership cap proposal will be a giant step in the right direction for the future of Division III. In closing, I ask for your support of this very important cap proposal. Thank you.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): I rise in opposition to this proposal. For an Association that prides itself on inclusion, this speaks of elitism. You are out, we are in and you are never going to get in. We have just passed a proposal that caps our championships at 64. Now, isn't that a novel approach? Many of us have been discussing that in the past.

Would it not be wiser to defer or defeat this motion? In 2010, the golden apple, the \$6 billion CBS contract will come up for review. Certainly, we know that our financial structure is based on that. Whether it will increase and assist us, we don't know. We would have a clearer understanding of what our finances are. By capping at 64, we are not going to five, six, seven weeks for our championships. A 64-team cap compacts it into a reasonable time frame. Inclusion, yes; elitism, no.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move to refer Proposal No. 12 to the NCAA Executive Committee's Working Group on Membership Issues.

[The motion was seconded.]

You have just heard several strong points that support the adoption of this proposal as well as several reasons why it should not be adopted. The Presidents Council recognizes the challenges caused by the increasing size of the Division III membership, particularly in areas such as championships access, access to programs and services, and staff support.

We also recognize that membership growth contributes to the diversity of our division. That diversity can be a benefit, but also a barrier to achieving consensus on the interpretation and application of the division's philosophy and key legislation.

The Council has a more immediate concern with this proposal, however. The Executive Committee has officially concluded that the implications of this proposal are Association-wide. This means it is questionable whether Division III really has the authority to adopt this proposal on its own.

That is why the Executive Committee established the working group, which has representation from all three divisions and will focus on Division II and Division III membership issues in an Association-wide context. The working group's report is due no later than the January 2007 Convention.

In support of this time line, the Division III Presidents Council has implemented an immediate moratorium on new provisional membership and a June 1 moratorium on reclassifying membership. The effective dates of these moratoriums are consistent with Proposal No. 12.

In short, referring this proposal to the working group would give that committee time to do its job in an Association-wide context. It will help us to avoid the potentially messy parliamentary issues of whether this proposal is out of order or not effective.

I would like to conclude my comments by noting that the Presidents Council is committed to offering solutions to membership issues at the 2007 Convention, based on the results of the working group, that are in the best interests of Division III.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support the motion to refer. Thank you.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Our conference is the sponsor of Proposal No. 12 you have moved to refer. I rise to speak to the referral of this legislation to the Executive Committee's working group. In the spirit of cooperation, I do not rise to oppose this referral, but to gain an understanding that should accompany the referral.

First, I share with this Convention without conceding to this referral that there is no indication that its numerous supporters around this room have lost their sense of urgency to gain the benefits of its passage. Second, that the initial report of this working group be completed by July 1, 2006, or approximately within six months. This time frame will allow the Division III membership to review the findings of the report and make recommendations, ensuring the return of a well-balanced proposal that will be acceptable to this body in January 2007. We cooperate in this referral to ensure the further adoption of a membership cap and other creative solutions that may be available provided by the working group for the re-organization of the NCAA. Thirdly, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this proposal to ensure the future health of Division III. This unhealthy condition has festered unaddressed in Division III in excess of 10 years. It is time to deal directly with the problem.

It is with this understanding that I offer the sponsor's cooperation and do not oppose the referral of Proposal No. 12 to the NCAA Executive Committee. Thank you very much.

Dick Strockbine (University of Dallas): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of the motion to refer Proposal No. 12. I want to commend the North Coast Athletic Conference for putting forward a proposal that recognizes and seeks to address issues at the heart of the future of Division III. An Association-wide study of the implication of the membership cap and the potential influx of new members to Divisions II and III benefits the entire Association and will give us thorough comprehensive solutions to issues that are significant to all divisions.

Accordingly, action on this proposal should be deferred until the 2007 Convention, at which time the study regarding the multi-divisional effects of a Division III membership cap will be completed and all potential issues addressed. I urge you to support the motion to refer.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. I need to interject for one moment. As the mover of the motion to refer, John, could you please address specifically who it is to be referred to and the effective date? There was a question on parliamentary issues.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): To the working group established by the Executive Committee.

Mr. Miranda: Would the formal report be issued no later than the Convention?

Mr. Fry: Yes, one year.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): If I could just address the timetable. The Executive Committee's working group's formal timetable is to report its final report by next Convention. The commitment and the goal is that a substantive report will be available by next summer, so that if the contents of that report are not to the liking of the sponsors or others who support a membership cap, that opportunity would then be available according to our legislative deadline in preparation for next year's Convention.

Mr. Miranda: Thanks for that clarification.

Steve Ulrich (Centennial Conference): In 1997, the Association moved to a federated system, allowing Divisions I, II and III to deal with issues that solely affected each division. In 2004, Division III adopted a resolution for a two-year study of the future of Division III, with the promise of legislation at this Convention.

Today, with the legislation before us, we are now told that this is an Association-wide issue that needs 365 days of more study. No matter where you stand on this issue, I would say this is first and foremost a Division III issue that the federation was set up to address. I would like to make sure that we all understand that there are a number of issues at Division I and Division II that affect all of us in this room that are not subject to an Association-wide study. Thank you.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. Are there any other comments on the motion to refer? Seeing no one at the microphone, then the vote will be on the motion to refer this to the Executive Committee.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 12 was adopted, 371-32-5.]

This might be an appropriate time to take a break. Let's take 15 minutes, and promptly return at 20 minutes of 11.

[The delegates recessed for 15 minutes.]

Mr. Miranda: We will now return to this morning's agenda. I believe we are ready for Proposal No. 13.

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP AND CHAMPIONSHIPS SELECTION — MEMBER CONFERENCE — SELF-STUDY GUIDE AND LIMITED REALIGNMENT PERIOD

Dale Knobel (Denison University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal requires conferences to conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation at least once every five years using a conference self-study guide. It also provides to conferences that complete the self-study a one-time conference realignment window so that conferences may use the results of the study to determine if current membership is appropriate given the values and mission of the conference without loss of championships automatic qualification.

The concept of a conference self-study and related realignment window originated with the study of the future of Division III. The survey strongly supported the idea that Division III conferences should exist for reasons beyond championships access. The NCAA provides many benefits to its member conferences besides automatic access to championships, including a conference vote, a large complement of grants, initiative funds and educational opportunities for student-athletes and athletics personnel.

This proposal establishes expectations and accountability for conferences receiving those benefits in order to be effective. It is imperative that an inclusive group of individuals participate in this self-study process. Moreover, the quality of dialogue will improve when the focus is on issues of importance for the conference rather than mere emphasis upon maintaining an automatic bid.

There will be no right or wrong answers to the issues raised in the self-study; however, it will raise fundamental questions that all conferences should address. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 13.

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

This proposal recognizes that like the current institutional self-study guide, the ISSG, the conference self-study should be a legislative requirement rather than simply a best practice. Members of the conference should be aligned by common conference goals and expectations, not just for an automatic qualification. The self-study encourages conferences to evaluate their membership to ensure that these goals and expectations are being met. The two-year realignment window allows them to do so without fear of being penalized. Based on the results of the self-study, if a conference determines that its current membership is not appropriate to meet conference goals and expectations, the conference and its members have a two-year window from August 1, 2008, until August 1, 2010, to realign and seek new members without loss of automatic qualification.

All institutions benefit when conference members are aligned by common goals instead of merely maintaining automatic qualification. I urge you to support this proposal.

Doug Tima (Otterbein College): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 13.

As a committee, we are in unanimous support of this proposal because it uses a conference self-study to promote positive realignment. We believe that the self-study is essential. It provides a venue through which student-athletes may voice their views on critical issues relating to their conferences' realignment. The self-study also enhances the student-athlete experience by improving the function and the effectiveness of existing conferences.

To support this proposal, student-athletes would have a direct voice in their conference decisions, which is consistent with the Division III philosophy. Thank you.

Dennis Leighton (University of New England): As president-elect of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

Our institutions regularly undergo periodic self-evaluation at a variety of levels, usually as a part of the

accreditation of the institution or specific programs. We also regularly receive and evaluate our athletics programs. All of these assessments serve a useful purpose of stimulating self-reflection, particularly in the area of athletics, and often result in changes that improve the student-athlete's experience. It seems logical that a conference self-study would result in the same outcome. The Faculty Athletic Representatives Association has recognized that the conference self-study could result in conference changes that would have a positive academic impact, such as common academic expectations or scheduling policies that would limit conflicts between class time and athletics competitions.

While trying to not violate Robert's Rules, or more importantly, the wrath of the chair, I would also like to point out Proposals 14 and 15 are not contrary to Proposal No. 13. On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I encourage support of Proposal No. 13.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. I will reserve my wrath for later. (Laughter) Is there any further comment?

James Moseley (Franklin College): Most of my career was spent as a faculty member. From my experience of those years, I believe that more and more self-study improves the world and our institutions. As a president, I worry about allocation of resources.

I have seen self-studies that improved organizations. Mandated self-studies rarely accomplish that purpose. There is nothing in the way of a conference undertaking a self-study now for these purposes, but one that we have to do every five years — that is twice as often as we do for institutional academic accreditation. That seems to me like busy work that we will all regret having to do when it comes down to us that somehow collectively in principle we will probably endorse. I urge you to vote against this proposal.

[Proposal No. 13 was adopted, 244-148-12.]

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION — CONFERENCE REALIGNMENT PERIOD

Debra Murphy (Nichols College): I am the chair of the presidents committee of the Commonwealth Coast Conference. On behalf of the CCC presidents, athletics directors and commissioner Steve Washkevich, I move Proposal No. 14 for your consideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to slightly deviate from protocol to point out a typo in the 2006 Division III NCAA Convention Official Notice. As noted in the revisions to the Official Notice, if you would look midway down Page 23 at the bold faced amendment proposal language, please note the last sentence of the proposed language should read: "For the purposes of this regulation, a new conference is one that includes no less than four institutions that belonged to the same conference during the most recent academic year."

The rationale for this proposal is to improve the student-athlete's experience. Our conferences were initially established in light of scheduling alliances and demands. Over time, growth and changes in conferences have occurred with the influence of the automatic qualifier potential.

Proposal No. 14 will allow for a window of opportunity to carefully examine and to potentially realign conferences based upon school missions, academic philosophies and athletics programs without the penalty of losing the conference's and other institutions' automatic qualifier.

No. 14 will work in conjunction with No. 13 and/or No. 15. It is not exclusive. In fact, the self-study that was just approved in No. 13 could be completed in 2007 for a re-organization in 2008. The Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Championships Committee are opposed to No. 14 because there was no self-study.

But with the passage of No. 13, the opposition from these groups should now be moot. Again, our hope is to continue to improve the student-athlete's experience with the realignment of conferences.

Finally, I would like to thank Leah Nilsson for her assistance in drafting this language. She was very helpful. I would like to thank you all for your consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. My apologies to the drafters of this proposal. I should have pointed out the editorial correction. That is my mistake.

Miriam Pride (Blackburn College): As a member of the Presidents Council, I do speak in opposition to

Proposal No. 14. The proposal would award an automatic qualification to a new conference without the two-year wait. While the governance structure supports opportunities to allow conferences to restructure and realign, it is also believed that there must be some basis to examine appropriate conference competition; namely, the conference self-study already passed.

The Council believes that the self-study process is an important piece, and the realignment proposal should include such a self-study. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 14.

Richard Wylie (Endicott College): I am the president of a college that is a member of the Commonwealth Coast Conference. I urge you to look at the institutions that are in the conference when there is a direct uneasiness.

When competition is not at the level of either the tops or the bottoms, what happens is that the students themselves are the ones who lose and suffer as a student-athlete. The whole notion behind Amendment 13 of the self-study is an important piece to No. 14. One allows for a reshuffling. The other allows for a redesign. I think that it is important that as an Association we can look at redesign and respect the value of redesign, and understand that it is important when institutions are changing as dramatically as many institutions are in Division III.

I urge you to consider very carefully the notion of redesign rather than just reshuffling. I urge you to consider Amendment No. 14 as something very important to a number of colleges in this country that are trying to find greater compatibility and greater relationships between institutions. Thank you very much.

Joyce Wong (Eastern Connecticut State University): As a member of the Management Council and the Championships Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 14.

The Championships Committee and Management Council agree with the inherent principles of this proposal knowing that many Division III conferences are currently aligned only to maintain the automatic qualification. Consideration for realignment must be done in combination with self-study and evaluation. The Championships Committee is not comfortable awarding brand new conferences with automatic qualification without the two-year waiting period, especially if the conference composition was determined without analysis of the important issues listed in the proposed conference self-study.

There is a practical concern as well. If existing automatic qualifications are preserved through Proposal 13 and/or 15, and new bids are awarded to these proposals, it could significantly reduce the Pools B and C at-large bids that are available. On behalf of the Management Council and the Championships Committee, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 14.

[Proposal No. 14 was defeated, 324-79-4.]

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION — SEVEN INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT — TWO-YEAR GRACE PERIOD

Mike Mitrano (Empire 8): On behalf of the Empire 8, I would like to move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

We are pleased that the membership approved Proposal 13 and the practice of a self-study. We think that is a beneficial practice. Our proposal complements Proposal No. 13 very well.

Our proposal has two key components. First, it aims to protect the automatic qualification status of the conferences that have already met the requirements set forth by the NCAA. It also seeks to provide conferences and member institutions reasonable time to evaluate potential new members to ensure they are of the right mind and philosophy as our division has always struck.

This proposal does not grant automatic qualification status to a newly formed conference for waiving the requirement in place to earn AQ status. It only seeks to provide protection to those that have already earned such status. Proposal No. 15 protects the conference for any reason if it falls below the minimum of seven members in a particular sport.

Proposal 13 does not allow that. Proposal 13 only protects you for that two-year period when one of your members leaves for another conference. Under our proposal, if a member cuts a team due to financial reasons, or if a member leaves the conference to join another division, an NAIA organization or another conference with-

in our own division, this legislation offers protection. It maintains quality opportunities for the conference's remaining student-athletes who have done nothing to precipitate the loss of the automatic qualification.

While Proposal No. 13 is in effect for just a two-year window, this legislation is always in effect. In 2010, if an automatic-qualifying conference dips below seven members, it would be protected. The period of protection is two years. Some will argue that this proposal will disrupt the championships pool allocation. In fact, this proposal provides more stability. Imagine if one or more of our conferences fell below seven without this protection. There would be a significant increase in Pools B and C, potentially with little notice. Not only would it negatively impact conferences, but also independent institutions' access. We believe this proposal is in the best interest of our Division III student-athletes, member institutions and conferences. Further, be advised that we are still required to conduct the self-study every five years, yet the protection is not offered to you beyond 2008 through Proposal 13.

We feel as a conference that philosophically we agree that the self-study is paramount to the integrity of our division. As such, as conferences show their good faith in the values of our division, we feel they should also be extended that protection beyond 2008. On behalf of the Empire 8, we ask for your support of Proposal No. 15.

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): I am a member of the Presidents Council. I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 15.

The Presidents Council certainly supports the concept of conference realignment in concert with a conference self-study program. This proposal is not about realignment per se, but would allow a two-year grace period for fluctuating conference membership. Because of this, a two-year grace period could occur at any point in the future and the conference could use this two-year grace period on multiple occasions. It would also then perpetuate constant variation in allocation of Pools A, B and C for championship selection purposes. This proposal doesn't require any standard for examining who joins and who leaves the conference. Its long-term nature abandons the concept that automatic qualification is for conferences of at least seven members that have conducted competition with each other for a significant period of time.

Because of this departure from core AQ principles and the lack of a required self-study instrument, on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 15.

Chad Yowell [Wheaton College (Massachusetts)]: As a member of the Management Council and Championships Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 15.

The Championships Committee does not support the concept of a proposed two-year grace period for conferences with membership that falls below seven institutions in a particular sport. There is value in stable conference membership, especially when the conference alignment is based on shared values and goals. A two-year grace period to be used at any point in the future introduces too much instability into the structure of Division III conferences.

The Championships Committee and the Council support a limited conference realignment period with a conference self-study and evaluation process, but believe this proposal goes too far in liberalizing automatic qualification requirements. On behalf of the Management Council and the Championships Committee, I urge you to oppose adoption of Proposal No. 15.

Charles Mitrano (Empire 8): I feel as though there is a very significant contradiction in the philosophy of our division and the rationale for defeating this proposal.

We have gone through a process — the future of Division III — that has focused on identifying our values. We are implementing a specific study, which is in place indefinitely, not just for five years, but every five years indefinitely. We have entered into a self-study to ensure that we are of like mind and values as conferences. Yet we are not extending protection. The explanation as to why we are not extending protection is because of concerns about championships. So are we about championships or are we about like-minded institutions? This is a contradiction that has been offered by the Presidents Council, and I hope you see that and understand that.

This is not about realignment. This is about protection. Many of us have been together for many years. We always have honored traditions, and we have grandfathered many different things within our legislation and within our structure. When conferences and institutions act together in good faith and are good citizens, they should not be penalized for that. I hope that you will support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 15 was defeated, 212-194-3.]

**EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR
CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION — PRIMARY CRITERIA — RANKING AND SELECTION —
STRENGTH-OF-SEASON INDEX**

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, the Ohio Athletic Conference and the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I wish to submit the withdrawal of Proposal No. 16.

In so doing, all three conferences wish to acknowledge and applaud the recent recognition by the Division III Championships Committee that the current criteria used to select at-large teams for the NCAA championships disadvantage institutions that play highly competitive schedules.

While encouraged by this development, and as a first step toward establishing and implementing criteria that will help to ensure that the most deserving teams are selected for NCAA postseason competition, each of the aforementioned conferences is still committed to closely monitoring the actions taken by the Championships Committee in hopes that addressing this inequity through the legislative process will not be necessary in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. I should note since this was an item in the Official Notice. It could still be moved for adoption if anyone would care to make that motion. Hearing none, the proposal is withdrawn.

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — EXCEPTION TO PLAYING SEASON LIMITATIONS AND
CONTEST EXEMPTION — POSTSEASON CHAMPIONSHIP EVENT**

Brian Streeter (Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College): On behalf of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, the Empire 8 and the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 17 is intended to bring into sync the various components of postseason competition, particularly regarding contest exemptions. It puts them into a consistent, inclusive, if not constructive, format. This proposal is not intended to roll back the clock on the reform effort of 2004. We do believe, however, that there was an unintended consequence of going from 21- to 18- and 19-week seasons. Student-athletes at many member institutions are actually losing a week of participation by choosing to declare for legally exempted postseason tournaments, such as most of the ECAC tournaments, and various national governing body tournaments.

Those contests exemptions were not eliminated in the reform agenda of 2004, but in essence the week to participate in them was. Under the current rules, schools must plan to save a week to participate in tournaments like those sponsored by the ECAC, USCAA and various national governing bodies. If a team is selected for such a tournament, no student-athletes will get to use their full 18- and 19-week seasons. But if they are not selected, those student-athletes lose the week of participation. Their season simply ends at 17 or 18.

Some have expressed concern that this legislation may be too broad. However, after speaking with member institutions across the country, we wrote this to be purposely inclusive legislation. That is to allow every school in Division III the same consistent opportunity. We are also careful to limit its application. A postseason championship event is carefully defined and the time for you to participate is very limited. It is not restrictive. Whether or not the institution takes advantage of this opportunity is left strictly up to an institution and its philosophy about the postseason competition.

If you believe in the value of postseason competition for our student-athletes, and if you support the Division III philosophy regarding regional competition, then this proposal addresses those values. We appreciate the support of the Division III SAAC for Proposal 17. We ask for your support as well.

Dale Knobel (Denison University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 17.

Contrary to the productive actions taken at the 2004 Convention, supporting this proposal would lengthen the playing and practice season for many institutions. The point of the reductions in 2004 was to give student-ath-

letes more time to engage in their primary academic pursuits and in other campus activities in order to foster a well-rounded student experience. The division supported reduction in weeks in order to establish a better balance between athletics and student life. We believe that student-athletes should have more time for exploring life beyond athletics, but given the time demands of their sports, even under present circumstances, many find it difficult to be involved in other extracurricular activities and to fulfill their academic responsibilities.

Approving this proposal will potentially add several weeks to the playing season for schools that participate in these events. Because I believe that student-athletes need time to be students and enjoy pursuits beyond athletics, I oppose this proposal, and on behalf of the Presidents Council urge you to do the same.

Holly Gera (Montclair State University): I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 17.

This proposal remains consistent with Division III philosophy and the intent of the reform measures adopted in 2004. Shortening playing seasons from 21 to 18 or 19 weeks unintentionally affected institutions that have traditionally declared to compete in a variety of postseason championship opportunities. Without Proposal 17, the championships themselves remain exempt. However, the extra days needed to participate in these championships do not. This proposal seeks to correct this inconsistency and also seeks to provide more consistency to the way the postseason championships are governed. Throughout this Convention, we have been celebrating the NCAA anniversary and the 25th anniversary of women's championships. I think you all would agree that history and tradition are important. Many of the championships that will be affected by the reduction of playing seasons have long histories and traditions as well. Since the schools that participate are selected based on competitive criteria, the total number of institutions that might play for that extra week is relatively small. However, the value and benefit of that participation to student-athletes is substantial. Proposal 17 will enable those schools selected to participate in postseason championships with the opportunity to do so without starting their season later than permissible by taking a week off in the midst of the season.

As noted in the rationale, it recognizes the value of the postseason championship experience for the student-athlete and provides a fair and consistent application for all sports. I urge your support of Proposal No. 17.

Patricia Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 17.

This proposal has the potential to compromise Division III priorities for its student-athletes and may result in increased missed class time and a diminished opportunity for student-athletes to develop interests and participate in activities outside of athletics. In 2004, the reductions to the playing and practice season were passed in order to allow student-athletes to better experience all that the inner-college student has to offer. Division III is unique in its desire to actively foster the development of a well-rounded student-athlete who has the opportunity to experience student life in all areas, not merely athletics.

Proposal No. 17 takes away some of the time given back to our student-athletes. Although athletic excellence is certainly to be admired, a well-rounded student-athlete who has gained a full experience at our institutions is a more worthy goal. Also, the Division III philosophy statement indicates that primary emphasis shall be given to regional and in-season competition and conference competition. This proposal increases emphasis on the postseason, contradicting one of the division's guiding principles. For these reasons, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 17. Thank you.

Steve Bamford (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the ECAC and our 188 Division III member institutions, I would like to share some rationale in support of Proposal No. 17.

The ECAC annually sponsors 79 individual and team championships at the Division III level. Last year, more than 10,000 student-athletes on 292 teams competed in 79 ECAC regional championship tournaments across the ECAC 12-state membership area. These figures indicate that the ECAC Division III member institutions historically have valued our ECAC postseason championships and the positive experiences they have provided to their student-athletes. Without question, our championship events are considered a step down from the experiences of competing for an NCAA championship. Nonetheless, our championships in all sports are enormously popular, because the ECAC membership has long recognized the need to reward successful teams that have not been selected for NCAA play with a postseason championship experience.

Supporting Proposal No. 17 will provide additional opportunities for more student-athletes across the coun-

try to experience the value of non-NCAA postseason championship competition. The adoption of this proposal will clearly enhance and expand the potential for a postseason opportunity to many more student-athletes from across the country without taking away from the regular-season experience. While we recognize Proposal No. 17 does not have the support of the Presidents Council nor the Management Council, we are very pleased to know that it does have the full support of the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. It also should be noted, if adopted, this legislation will afford student-athletes a good chance to take full advantage of the 18- and 19-week season that they are currently allowed. In addition, it will eliminate the need to save a week, or in the case of those student-athletes whose teams are not selected to a non-NCAA championship tournament, they will not lose a week.

Finally, not only would this legislation provide some relief to NCAA championships, where current field sizes are close to capacity, it would continue to offer teams not selected for postseason NCAA participation an opportunity for their student-athletes to compete in a high-quality regional postseason championship.

For all the reasons previously stated, for the benefit of all student-athletes across this great country of ours, and in keeping with the theme of this year's Convention — Celebrating the Student-Athlete — I urge you to vote yes and adopt Proposal No. 17.

Dan Fulks (Transylvania University): I am a member of the executive committee of the Faculty Athletic Representatives Association. For reasons well spoken on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, FARA opposes this proposed legislation. We believe it will extend the playing and practice seasons contrary to the 2004 legislation. Thank you.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): It took me a little longer to get to the microphone. I had to release myself from those shackles that were placed on my chair. (Laughter) I thought I had the key. I will be Houdini this time.

I rise in support of this proposal. I want to interject a little bit of athleticism back into the student-athlete. My thinking on this is that so many of us, as we saw earlier when those of us who competed as student-athletes raised our hands, participated in athletics. Every student-athlete deserves to participate in a championship event. An ECAC championship is an event similar to what probably has been referred to as the NIT. I know the NCAA has shelled out a lot of our money to purchase that, but those student-athletes who participated in the NIT and those student-athletes who participate in the ECAC do have a championship experience. It may be just one year out of five or six that an institution has the opportunity. They have not competed in the NCAA. They are a tier below. This, indeed, provides those student-athletes that opportunity. You, as a former student-athlete, would have relished that.

I know our student-athletes have welcomed the opportunity to participate in those tournaments and future ones will as well. I think I am on a roll right now. I have had two defeats and a referral, so I am looking for a victory on this one.

[Proposal No. 17 was defeated, 213-87-7.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT LENGTH AND MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS

Mr. Miranda: We can now move to Proposal No. 18. Is there someone present to move the proposal? Seeing no one at the microphone to move the proposal, it dies for the lack of a motion.

I am informed that we can then move on to actually what would be Proposal No. 24, but if someone chooses to make a motion to consider No. 18 out of the order that it was published, they may do that. As I understand it, that would take a two-thirds majority to support the proposal out of order.

RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — COMPETITION AGAINST PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

The philosophy of the Division III tryout legislation supports the principle that no coach or administrator should be testing the athletic abilities of prospects regardless of the context in which the physical activity occurs. As a matter of parity, a subvarsity and varsity team should be bound by the same prohibition regarding competition against high school or preparatory school teams, and to enhance the collegiate experience our institutions should be encouraged to play teams of other four-year colleges. I urge your support of Proposal No. 24.

John Biddiscombe [Wesleyan University (Connecticut)]: Junior varsity teams are integral to a broad-based program. It affords opportunities for students who will not otherwise get to play on intercollegiate teams. It is an opportunity for the development of student-athletes, most of whom were not recruited, and for them to receive expert coaching, mentoring and the valuable benefits of participating on the team. Most importantly, it affords them an opportunity to continue to play the sport they love. Many of the colleges and universities that schedule contests with private schools do so because it reduces the cost of travel and missed class time. However, most importantly, without these games there would be very few teams to play against. At my institution, for example, 60 percent of our JV contests are against private schools. Without these games, we would not be able to continue our JV schedule.

In order to help the membership decide how to vote on this important matter, I would like to ask someone from the committees that were the source of this proposal to provide us with the data or the documentation that playing against private schools is being used as tryouts and creating recruiting advantages or creating an unfair advantage. For example, how many schools sponsoring JV teams, in fact, had athletes on their varsity rosters who were from private schools that played against that school's JV team? How many schools actually had JV teams and how many athletes would be involved?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): The Interpretation and Legislative Committee reviewed this proposal last July without the particular data that has been requested.

Suzanne Everden (Amherst College): I speak in opposition to this proposal, and like John I ask two questions. Do the sponsors realize that without the chance for these playing opportunities many JV programs would cease to exist? Secondly, do the sponsors have any other information with regard to the number of student-athletes who would be negatively affected by this legislation? Thank you.

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 24. The current try-out rule only prohibits varsity Division III teams from competing against high school or preparatory school teams.

Scheduling challenges for subvarsity teams should not be a reason to allow competition against high school or preparatory school teams. This proposal brings consistency to the application of the rule for all Division III teams regardless of whether a contest involves a Division III freshman, sophomore, junior varsity or varsity team. I urge you to support Proposal No. 24. Thank you.

John Biddiscombe [Wesleyan University (Connecticut)]: With due respect to the committees that spent time reviewing this proposal and preparing it for the Convention legislation, I would like to suggest that in fact there was not substantial information to develop this legislation. There was very little input from the schools that are in the geographical locations of the United States that have the opportunity to play against private schools. I am not sure all of the implications were really factored in to this legislation. I would certainly urge us to take that under consideration on how we vote for this proposal.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I understand why we might not want our teams to play against high schools, but for those of us who are in the Midwest and don't see a lot of prep schools, what is the definition of a prep school? Is it post-high school?

Ms. Nilsson: It would be post-high school and for the rest of your recruiting regulations student-athletes enrolled in preparatory schools are still considered prospects to your colleges.

Mr. Kaiser: Okay. I understand that. But prep school people normally have graduated from high school.

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): Not in all cases. I would say the intent of the legislation is picking up students who are not considered to be enrolled in a college degree program, whether it is a two-year school or a four-year school. I know there have been references to private institutions on one of the delegate's part, but that was referring to prep schools. Prep school and high school students are considered prospects for purposes of try-out legislation, which this is coming out of in Bylaw 13.

Mr. Kaiser: Thank you.

Cathie Schweitzer (Springfield College): I stand before you in opposition to Proposal No. 24. In light of the comments that have been made thus far, and the fact that so little data have been presented to support Proposal 24 at this time, I move to refer the proposal to the Management Council for further review.

Mr. Miranda: We have a motion to refer. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded and approved, 213-178-9.]

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL — SELF-STUDY REPORT — FAILURE TO SUBMIT

Ivory Nelson (Lincoln University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Institutional Self-Study Guide is an important tool for evaluating and improving Division III athletics departments. Importantly, it engages the entire campus community in dialogue regarding athletic issues. Historically, many institutions have not adhered to the ISSG submission deadline. This proposal establishes significant progressive penalties for institutions that fail to submit the ISSG by the legislative deadline. The penalties mirror those for Division III membership requirements when an institution first fails to submit the notification of completion form during the academic year in which it is due. It is placed on probation, and a one-year window is established. If the institution does not submit the notification of completion form by the end of the probationary year or incurs another failed submission within that window, the institution is placed in restricted status. If the institution does not submit the form in the restricted year, the institution is reclassified and that is it. The Management Council may grant a waiver of this requirement when extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

From 1998 to 2005, 56 Division III institutions failed to submit ISSG notification of completion forms to the NCAA national office on time. The submission deadline is significant and needs to be clearly strengthened. This proposal specifies that an institution that fails to meet the ISSG deadline will be notified that it has been placed on probation for one year. Prolonged failure to meet the deadline shall result in restricted and then corresponding membership status. Further, the Management Council may grant a waiver of this requirement when extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

By establishing the significant penalties for late submission, this proposal highlights the ISSG and the criteria critical to being a Division III member. I urge you to support Proposal No. 19.

Dick Strockbine (University of Dallas): As a member of the Division III Management Council and the Division III Membership Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 19.

From 1998 to 2005, 56 Division III institutions failed to submit ISSG notification of completion forms to the NCAA national office on time. The submission deadline is significant and needs to be clearly strengthened. Personnel changes in the ADs office or elsewhere cannot be used as the reason the ISSG was completed late or not completed at all. The study does not rest on the shoulders of the AD alone. It is designed to be a campus-wide effort with campus community scope and input. The ISSG is a valuable evaluation tool that should be taken seriously by the Division III membership. I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 19.

[Proposal No. 19 was adopted, 374-24-2.]

FINANCIAL AID — FAILURE TO SUBMIT ANNUAL ELECTRONIC REPORT — APPLICATION OF RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP STATUS

James Moseley (Franklin College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Prohibition of awarding financial aid is a primary tenet of Division III. This proposal recognizes the importance of the financial aid reporting process and its relationship to the Division III philosophy. Because of this relationship, filing an annual financial aid report should be viewed as an obligation of the membership in

Division III. Related penalties for non-compliance should mirror those for other Division III membership requirements, such as the five-sport, three-season requirement.

Failure to meet the terms of this important obligation should have membership ramifications, as this report measures an institution's commitment to one of the most significant prongs of the Division III philosophy statement. In recognition of the value of this process, I urge you to support Proposal No. 20. Thank you.

Kevin McHugh (The College of New Jersey): I am a member of the Division III Management Council and the Financial Aid Committee. I speak in support of Proposal No. 20.

Similar to the proposal just discussed, this proposal asks for progressive membership penalties for failure to submit a key Division III report — the annual electronic financial aid report. I would like to distinguish the penalty for a late report and a failed submission.

If an institution misses the September 30 deadline, it loses championships and grant access until the report is submitted. If the institution fails to submit the report by the end of the academic year in which it is due, more significant penalties are applied. According to Proposal No. 20, and just like the ISSG process described in Proposal No. 19, an institution is placed on probation for the first failure to submit the annual electronic financial aid report. A 10-year window was established when the institution goes on probation. If the institution does not submit the financial aid report by the end of the probationary year or incurs another failed submission within that 10-year window, the institution is placed in restricted membership. If the institution does not submit the form by the end of the restricted year, it is reclassified into corresponding membership, where the institution receives little more than general NCAA publications.

These membership-related penalties are appropriate and fair given the importance of the financial aid reporting process. The Division III membership should not tolerate repeated failures by its members to comply with this crucial obligation. I ask you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted, 390-9-3.]

Mr. Miranda: Because of your diligence and succinct debate, we find ourselves ahead of schedule. I have been coming to these for a number of years, and I don't recall that happening before. But we are not unprepared for such a thing. What we would like to do with your acquiescence is to consider some of the paddle votes at this point before we break for lunch so we might conclude earlier in the afternoon and don't surprise the hotel staff that is planning on us getting done in a few more minutes. If that has general agreement, I don't think we need to have a roll-call vote on that. If that is something that you are willing to accept, can we have a general flash of the paddles? Okay. That is close enough.

I would like to point out a couple of things before we proceed to the paddle votes. There are four items — Proposal Nos. 21, 23, 25 and 27 — that the Management Council intends at its post-Convention meeting to move to an immediate effective date if they are approved. Please keep that in mind as you consider those proposals.

I believe we are prepared to move to Proposal No. 21.

ETHICAL CONDUCT — UNETHICAL CONDUCT — PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation does not specify that the act of providing impermissible substances, such as a banned prescription drug, is an institutional violation. This proposal clarifies that such an egregious act violates the Association's ethical conduct bylaw and is contrary to the health and safety of student-athletes.

Unfortunately, some institutional personnel have provided impermissible prescription drugs to student-athletes to enhance their performance. This act violates the general principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct, competitive equity, and most importantly, student-athlete well-being. Adopting this proposal clearly delineates that any individual who provides impermissible substances to student-athletes is in violation of the Association's unethical conduct bylaw. It is important to note that this proposal would not apply to student-athletes with a documented medical history demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug.

It should also be noted that due to the potential impact on the student-athlete's health and safety, the Management Council will pursue an immediate effective date for this proposal at its post-Convention meeting. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

Charlie Wilson (Olivet College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 21.

This proposal verifies that providing impermissible substances, such as prescription drugs that impacts student-athlete's performance, is unethical. There is nothing that is more important than protecting the health and well-being of our student-athletes. Adopting this proposal will enhance the NCAA enforcement staff's ability to allege a violation of unethical conduct and the Committee on Infractions' ability to find an unethical conduct violation for an individual who provides an impermissible substance to a student-athlete.

It is unfortunate that we have to regulate this type of activity. Adding this provision may not completely end this practice, but it sends a message that should be loud and clear that this type of behavior will not be tolerated. As you heard before, the Management Council will pursue an immediate effective date for this proposal at its post-Convention meeting in order to discourage this behavior from today forward. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted.]

PERSONNEL — LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS — EXHIBITION CONTESTS

Julius Erlenbach (University of Wisconsin, Superior): On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current NCAA rules, institutional staff members are not permitted to scout an exhibition contest in which a future scheduled opponent is participating. Since scouting and attending are inseparable acts, this rule prohibits institutional staff members from even attending such events.

Unlike scrimmages, exhibition games by definition and design are no different than regular-season games with the exception that the final results are not reflected in the win-loss record of the participating teams. Therefore, attending — or we could say scouting — an exhibition game in which a future opponent is participating provides no discernible competitive advantage, thereby rendering the current restriction unnecessary.

Lastly, it should be noted that this proposal is supported by both the NCAA Management Council and the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Thank you.

Kay Whitley (Sul Ross State University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 22.

Existing scouting legislation prohibits coaches from attending unique exhibition contests in NCAA Division I or Division II institutions. However, coaches should be able to attend events, such as the recent basketball exhibition games between Division III and Divisions I or II schools. This proposal will allow coaches to attend popular, often well-publicized early or preseason exhibition contests. Attending an exhibition contest in which a future opponent is participating does not provide an appreciable competitive advantage. For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 22. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 22 was adopted.]

RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISITS — MEAL LOCATION

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

A prospective student-athlete's official visit experience should reflect normal college life, so dining should be comparable to that of current students. Proposal No. 23 recognizes this right and the fact that on-campus dining can be more expensive than purchasing food from local vendors. This proposal specifies that meals provided to

a prospective student-athlete and the prospective student-athlete's parents, guardians or spouse must occur on campus and must be on a scale comparable to normal student life and similar to dining options available to the student body. It permits meals to be purchased from on- or off-campus vendors. I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 23.

Charlie Wilson (Olivet College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 23.

Proposal No. 23 recognizes that on-campus dining costs may be more expensive than ordering food from a local restaurant or caterer, just like ordering food service in the hotel is more expensive than going down to the restaurant. This proposal requires that meals on official visits still must be eaten on campus; however, it allows institutions' discretion to buy meals off campus as long as they are comparable to normal student dining options. For greater efficiency, if this proposal is adopted, the Division III Management Council intends to implement an immediate effective date at its post-Convention meeting. I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 23. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted.]

Mr. Miranda: As you recall, Proposal 24 was reordered and we have already considered it, so we will move now to Proposal No. 25.

RECRUITING — PROHIBITED EXPENSES — DONATIONS OF USED ATHLETICS EQUIPMENT

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University(Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal allows institutions to support their local communities with donation of used athletics equipment. Institutions are frequently asked to donate their used equipment to youth groups. However, under the current legislation, that type of donation is viewed as a recruiting inducement. The potential recruiting advantage gained by these donations is diminished by the positive impact they would have on the individuals receiving the equipment.

In order for the proposal to be fair, it is important to work within institutional guidelines to ensure donations are not being given for the purpose of strengthening the relationship with prospects' coaches as opposed to assisting the local community. I urge you to support Proposal No. 25.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 25.

Oftentimes, individuals in youth groups are the people who get the most and best use of our equipment, especially when that equipment is no longer needed. In this instance, the legislative prohibition on such donations paints too broad of a stroke and leads to a wasteful result for usable equipment that is thrown away for fear of fostering a recruiting advantage. This proposal benefits institutions and local communities. Institutions are able to assist their youth and communities that are able to re-use items that otherwise would have been discarded. In order to take advantage of the donations, the NCAA Division III Management Council intends to implement an immediate effective date if this proposal is adopted. I urge you to vote yes for Proposal No. 25.

[Proposal No. 25 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT — CHAMPIONSHIP ELGIBILITY

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University(Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

Generally speaking, NCAA championships are the reward for athletics excellence during the regular season. However, championships should also be viewed as a reward for student-athletes who satisfy all academic and athletics eligibility requirements during the academic year. It is not appropriate for a student-athlete to be eligible for an NCAA championship that occurred during the vacation period immediately following the conclusion of the transfer residence requirement since that championship was tied to a season during which the individual was

not eligible for other competition.

This proposal reinforces the principle of academic success and its connection to championships eligibility. I urge you to support Proposal No. 26.

Kay Whitley (Sul Ross State University): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 26.

This proposal addresses the potential championships eligibility of a student-athlete who was serving a transfer year in residence at his or her institution during the championship year. This proposal recognizes that it is not appropriate for a student-athlete to be eligible for an NCAA championship that occurred during the vacation period immediately following the conclusion of the transfer residence requirement since that championship was tied to a season during which the student-athlete was not eligible for other competition. I ask you to vote yes on Proposal No. 26. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 26 was adopted.]

AWARDS AND BENEFITS — BENEFITS, GIFTS AND SERVICES — PERMISSIBLE — OCCASIONAL MEALS

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University(Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, student-athletes are permitted to receive occasional meals from institutional personnel outside of the home setting. This proposal will allow representatives of athletics interests to provide an occasional meal to student-athletes in a restaurant, thereby providing an additional opportunity for such meals to occur. In the case of meals that occur outside of an athletics representative's home, that continues to be at the institution's discretion as to the location of the meal. I urge you to support Proposal No. 27.

Patricia Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 27.

It is reasonable for a representative of athletics interests to want to host a meal for a number of student-athletes outside of his or her home. In many instances, it may be a matter of logistics. A large group of people may be better suited for a restaurant. Our representatives of athletics interests provide valuable support to our student-athletes and our institutions. Many are leaders in the community and serve as positive role models. As long as the institution continues to approve the setting of the meals, there is no reason representatives of athletics interests should be banned from offering student-athletes occasional meals outside the home setting while institutional personnel are free to do so. I ask for you to vote yes on Proposal No. 27. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 27 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST CONTEST AND PRACTICE DATE — FOOTBALL

John Krogman (University of Wisconsin, Platteville): On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal simply provides institutions the flexibility to schedule their first football game on the Thursday before the Labor Day weekend in those years in which the first permissible contest date falls on Labor Day weekend. Thus, an institution could play its first game one day earlier than is currently permissible. For those institutions that find themselves geographically and/or competitively isolated, one viable option for filling out non-conference schedules is to compete against Division II opponents. This slight modification would make the Division III start date consistent in many years with that for Division II, thereby increasing the opportunity to schedule games closer to home, which will often translate into less missed class time and/or reduced travel costs. To eliminate any concerns or issues relating to a resulting increase in the length of the playing and practice season for football, this proposal also stipulates that institutions choosing to compete on the Thursday before Labor

Day shall not commence practice on a date any sooner than what is now permitted.

As permissive legislation, this proposal would allow each institution to determine for itself whether to play on the Thursday or Friday of the Labor Day weekend and thus select the date that would have the least impact on its own academic calendar and travel costs. Lastly, it should be noted that this proposal is supported by the NCAA Management Council, the Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee, and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I urge your support for Proposal No. 28. Thank you.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 28.

This proposal recognizes the difficulty many institutions face when scheduling football competitions in order to fill their schedule. Institutions located in certain areas of the country have added travel concerns as well. Proposal 28 provides limited scheduling flexibility for institutions sponsoring football without lengthening the season. Specifically, it does not move back the first permissible practice date in August.

These accommodations are reasonable and will serve to ease scheduling and travel concerns. Most importantly, the flexibility granted by this proposal may result in less missed class time for student-athletes and lower costs. Therefore, on behalf of the Management Council, I urge you to support Proposal 28.

[Proposal No. 28 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS — LACROSSE

Pete Bothner (Nazareth College): I am the chair of the Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee. On behalf of the Empire 8, I move Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 29 is to create consistency in the sport of lacrosse with other sports such as soccer and field hockey that have traditional and nontraditional seasons. Lacrosse is the only sport that does not have clearly defined traditional and nontraditional contest limitations. We have a total number of 17 contest dates for the academic year. Proposal No. 29 seeks to define the traditional season with 17 dates of competition and one date of competition in the nontraditional season.

We appreciate the support of the Management Council, the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, and the Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee. Thank you.

Chad Yowell [Wheaton College (Massachusetts)]: As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 29.

This proposal brings consistency to all sports in Division III by treating the sport of lacrosse in the same manner as all other team sports for contest limits. In so doing, lacrosse does increase annual dates of competition by one. This proposal clarifies what has been a confusing format issue and is consistent with the original intent of the contest limit. I urge your support of Proposal 29. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 29 was adopted.]

Mr. Miranda: That brings us to the end of the legislative items on the agenda. I will turn to Phil for further instructions. Thank you all.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SELECTION

Philip Stone [Bridgewater College (Virginia)]: Hang in there for just a few more minutes so we don't surprise the folks who are going to serve us lunch and can take care of a business item on the agenda.

We need to select the Management Council members for next year. Under our governance structure, the Nominating Committee solicits and selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review these nominations, but the positions are ultimately approved by you at this session. We have three positions open and one position that is subject to re-election. You should have received those names in advance of the meeting. I am going to call on Paul Moyer, director of athletics at Moravian College and chair of the Nominating Committee to present the slate to see if it meets with your approval.

Paul Moyer (Moravian College): Thank you. The Nominating Committee wishes to thank the Division III membership for its interest in serving in the NCAA governance structure. We do, however, need your continued support and interest. As President Stone mentioned earlier, since last year's Convention, the Nominating Committee has made appointment recommendations for nearly 100 committee vacancies. Currently, there are more than 250 individuals serving on Division III committees. Of those members, 58 percent are men, 42 percent are women and 10 percent are ethnic minorities. There are another 60-plus Division III members serving on Association-wide committees. The Nominating Committee is committed to supporting the strategic goals of the NCAA by increasing the number of women and ethnic minorities who participate in the NCAA structure. This is an area where we need your help. Please encourage your colleagues to nominate individuals or encourage self-nominations. Just so you are aware, more than 95 percent of the nominations in our division are self-nominations. In either case, nominations are easily submitted electronically and remain active for two years. Nomination information can be accessed online under the governance section on the NCAA Web site.

It should be noted that two immediate vacancies were filled in October 2005 by Del Malloy, Salve Regina University director of athletics, and Rudy Keeling, director of athletics at Emerson College. If you would like more information about committee service, please contact Sharon Tufano, the NCAA committee coordinator, at the national office.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the following slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council: Reappointment of Kevin McHugh, director of athletics, The College of New Jersey; Larry Glover, director of athletics, Fisk University; Kristen Hall, director of athletics, Bard College; and Jack Ohle, president of Wartburg College. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Stone: Does anyone want to amend the slate by proposing an additional name? Does anybody need to be heard on a nominee? All right. This can be done by a paddle vote.

[The slate of Management Council nominees was approved.]

We also have recently elected members of the Presidents Council. We look forward to having them serve. We have one of them here today — Joseph Bascuas, Medaille College. He may have stepped out, but he was here earlier and has participated in our meetings, although his term does not really begin until after the Convention. We also recently elected Pamela Gann of Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges, and Paul Tribble of Christopher Newport University. We congratulate them.

I would like to turn to Tim Gleason for a point of privilege.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): Thank you very much. As the outgoing president of the Division III Commissioners Association, I would like to announce the recipient of our annual Meritorious Service Award. This award means a great deal to us.

It can go and has gone to anyone in the Division III ranks who has worked passionately and unceasingly through the years for the betterment of Division III. We made the presentation Saturday, but we would like all of you to know that this year's recipient is Dennis Collins, executive director of the North Coast Athletic Conference. (Applause)

Mr. Stone: Dennis, our congratulations to you.

I told you that when we came back from lunch that we would do the reconsideration of the morning's roll-call votes and then do paddle voting and reconsideration of those votes. You have done such a good job that we have done all the business.

We will have our window of reconsideration for both roll-call and paddle votes when we come back from lunch. Please keep in mind that if you move to reconsider, you must be prepared to indicate that you voted on the prevailing side of the proposal and you want it to be reconsidered. A second to that motion will put it before us.

We will take an hour for lunch. I would like for you to be back at 1:15 to commence our afternoon session. Thank you. We are recessed for lunch.

[The business session was recessed for lunch.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Stone: We have completed the handling of all the legislative proposals. We are now ready to turn to any motions you might have for reconsideration of actions taken before the lunch break. I will turn to Mike Miranda to process any motions for reconsideration.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you, Phil. Welcome back, everyone. We will first open the window of reconsideration of roll-call votes.

The window of reconsideration is now open for Proposals Nos. 1 through 20 and 24. As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by a majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies and the proposal is then back before us for further discussion and another vote. Finally, please remember that a vote on a motion to reconsider and any subsequent vote will require a roll-call vote, since the proposals that we considered earlier were roll-call votes.

Is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled this morning from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION — SEVEN INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT — TWO-YEAR GRACE PERIOD

Susan Petersen-Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): I was on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 15, and I ask for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of discussion, I would like to hear a little bit more. I had some concerns regarding the fourth point in the proposal. Since we have had the vote, I have heard some other things. I would like to hear more people get up and discuss this proposal again. Thank you.

Charles Lindemann (Northwest Conference): We voted on the prevailing side as well. During the break, I had an opportunity to ask for an interpretation, and we were surprised by the results. I wanted to share that with you.

Our conference has nine members and we sponsor 18 sports. There are certain sports in which we are at the number seven in terms of automatic qualification. Suppose we had a program that identified two years in advance that it might need to make a change in its sports sponsorship. If we went out a year in advance and identified another Division III member school that sponsored that sport and brought them in as an affiliate member before the time that our other school decided it needed to drop the sport, I asked would we be able to make a seamless transition. In other words, we would never be at a point where we had fewer than seven schools sponsoring that sport. The answer I was given was that if one school was added to the conference and three months later another school dropped the sport in our conference, we would be without automatic qualification in that sport for two years.

There was no way to make a seamless transition under any circumstances based on the scenario I have identified. On that basis, I believe our conference is going to change its position on No. 15.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. Does the staff want to comment on that?

Leah Nilsson (NCAA Staff): We had a quick powwow. It may not have sounded exactly like the question that I had been asked before the break. I want to clarify the facts that were just presented.

Was the question if your conference had more than seven schools sponsoring a sport and you knew one school was going to leave and you brought in an affiliate institution for a two-year period as a member of your conference what the status of that institution would be?

Mr. Lindemann: You have to understand in the western United States we don't have the choice of more full members. So we were looking at an affiliate in a particular sport. We will bring the affiliate in before the time that the other institution drops the sport, but the affiliate has not been with us for two years. Even though we tried

to make a seamless transition, we are unable to do it. Would we lose our automatic qualifier?

Ms. Nilsson: Yes. I didn't hear it correctly the first time. That is correct. If an institution comes in brand new, you have to wait two years to get the AQ. I am not sure if I am 100-percent clear at the point they actually joined your conference. But if they are coming in, yes, the conference is subject to a two-year wait.

Charles Mitrano (Empire 8): We are pleased by the interest to re-visit this proposal, and we obviously support that motion. I would like to address the issue regarding four members. Please be aware that when you passed Proposal No. 13, you approved that as a standard. Proposal No. 13 establishes four core members as the minimum. I repeat, 13 establishes four core members as the minimum. You have already approved that. I will explain it to the best of my ability. Leah and Matt, I certainly encourage you to correct me.

Four core members means four of your full members is involved in multiple sports within your conference. That does not mean that you could not have four core members and two affiliates. It is possible that you could have four core members, two affiliates and still lose your AQ.

Mr. Miranda: Are there any other comment on the motion to reconsider?

Mary Jo Gunning (Marywood University): I urge my colleagues to support this motion to reconsider.

I believe that we need to think of this window of opportunity because it gives us the chance to really recognize the true aspects of Proposal 15 without looking at the effects of 13 and 14. I have overheard during the last hour and a half much conversation that my colleagues, some who voted against this proposal, did so because of the feeling that four core institutions was too few. But I believe we need to recognize that with the passage of 13, we have already approved four core members and a conference self-study. I believe without passing, reconsidering and not passing this proposal, that conferences through no real fault of their own are being penalized. I ask you on behalf of the Pennsylvania Athletic Conference to please vote yes for 15 if reconsidered. Thank you.

Sameer Khan (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): I am a golf student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 15.

Like Proposal 13, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal 15 with the notion that these two can cohesively work together. Now that Proposal 13 was adopted, with the inclusion of the self-study, it is in the best interest of the student-athlete that this proposal be adopted. Thank you.

Chuck Sack (Neumann College): I would just like to lend my support to Proposal 15 for reconsideration on behalf of the student-athletes. Passage of Proposal 15 would protect the championship opportunities for those student-athletes. In the year of Celebrating the Student-Athlete, I would ask everyone to reconsider.

Mr. Miranda: Are there any other comments on the motion to reconsider Proposal No. 15? Seeing no one at a microphone, we are prepared to vote on the motion to reconsider.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 15 was approved, 254-133-1.]

We can now move to review the proposal itself. If anyone wishes to discuss the proposal, please move to the microphone.

Chuck Gordon [Augustana College (Illinois)]: Our conference has six members, which currently does not qualify for automatic qualification, and it is a Pool B candidate. If I am following this correctly, would a conference that had seven members and then drops to four have two years of an AQ with four institutions while they figure out what is going on? Is that correct?

Ms. Nilsson: That is correct.

Mr. Gordon: This is at the same time golf and tennis were embarking on a new AQ for their sports. A number of years ago, we passed legislation that increased Pool C options. Automatic qualifications were limited, and we have a ratio of Pool B. We are not denying student-athletes access to championships. At another institution I was at, we were a Pool B team. We had good teams, and we still got in. Institutions that would be losing an AQ would still be eligible on a 1 to 6.5 through Pool B, and if they were qualified would still have their student-athletes have access to championships.

If the conference in some sports had six, it might be a little difficult for us to sit back and watch for two years while a conference that has four qualifies for golf or tennis, while some of our teams don't. I don't think it is really a championships access issue, because the access is the same. It is just through a different pool. We voted no, and we will vote no again. Thank you.

Charles Mitrano (Empire 8): I appreciate the comments of the preceding speaker, and I would like to speak to that as well. I think the fact that you are in a Pool B situation right now is exactly the reason why you should support this, because it promotes stability in Pool A.

Without notice, without this legislation, should my conference or any conference here fall below the minimum of seven, you suddenly have six institutions from that one conference that are now competing for Pool B slots. Again, it is without notice. I think more importantly and to the point about the philosophy and the values that we hold true as a division, we need to talk reality. The reality is there has been movement within our division already. The reality is almost immediately after they lost institutions, they gained institutions.

You cannot fault the conferences that do that. They are doing what they need to do based on the legislation that they are facing. I urge you to support this proposal to provide us the protection that we all deserve. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 15 was adopted upon reconsideration, 228-155-2.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — EXCEPTION TO PLAYING SEASON LIMITATIONS AND CONTEST EXEMPTION — POSTSEASON CHAMPIONSHIP EVENT

Linda Anderson (Maryville University of St. Louis): I would like to move Proposal No. 17 for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over lunch there was some conversation that there is some information out there that may help some people better understand the proposal. I feel the information deserves to be put out on the floor and heard and the proposal needs to be reconsidered.

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): For as much education as we tried to do ahead of this Convention, the sponsors of Proposal No. 17 have found there is considerable misunderstanding of the application of 17. We were disappointed when it failed, but we were greatly enlightened over lunch when we talked to a number of people.

We would like to clarify several points in No. 17. For tournaments other than the NCAA and the NAIA, the times to participate is indeed limited to a single week, not several weeks as erroneously stated earlier by an opposing speaker. Please don't think that 17 is adding as much time on to the playing and practice season as it takes to compete in the NAIA or the NCAA. That is simply not true. The legislation is very limiting in how much time is added. When you get down to it, considering that many of the contests for these postseason championship events already exist in Bylaw 17 and are already exempt, we are only talking about three to four more days. That is three to four more days. That is for practice.

Second, there is nothing requiring a school or conference to participate in a postseason championship event. Members of the ECAC, for example, in any given year, they don't all declare to participate. It is not a requirement, and when this is applied as an opportunity for institutions across the country, there is nothing saying that everyone must participate in an event other than their conference tournament or the NCAA or NAIA tournaments.

It is not restrictive. It is an opportunity. It is a choice. It is not unlike the nontraditional season. If you don't want to participate in it, you don't. If your conference as a group wants to agree to not participate, you don't. It is your decision.

There seems to be concern about coaches going out and putting together these tournaments on their own. The legislation again is very clear about what needs to happen for any of these tournaments to exist. I would suggest that if you have coaches going out doing it, that is a matter of institutional control. That is a much bigger issue than the existence of a postseason championship event. The assertion that this will unduly extend the playing season is simply not valid. The loss of a week of the playing season by a large number of our student-athletes, as currently exists, is very real.

There is one other comment we would like to be clear about. We believe that the ECAC, the Eastern College Athletic Conference, is something of a misnomer and misunderstood by our colleagues in other parts of the coun-

try. It is not another conference that you automatically participate in its tournament. It is not unlike the reference made earlier to the NIT. It is a selective-type of tournament. Again, most of the student-athletes who participate, the institutions who declare, are not selected. Proposal 17 corrects an inequity in the playing season while respecting institutional autonomy.

We would appreciate your support to bring this back for reconsideration.

Kayla Hinkley (University of New England): I am a field hockey and lacrosse student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 17. An integral part of the student-athlete experience is the prospect of participation in a postseason championship event.

Student-athletes are motivated to excel in their pursuits with the hope that if their hard work and commitments are strong enough, they will have the opportunity to participate in a championship event. Hard work and commitment as was shown in the video this morning, demonstrated our values at the core of the student-athlete experience. We urge you to support this proposal and to consider the fact that postseason championship events and the student-athlete experience are indivisible. Thank you.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. I have a quick reminder. We are seeking comments on the motion to reconsider, not necessarily on the merits of the proposal itself.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): I was thinking of introducing myself as Ivory Nelson seeing that he has a much better record than I do. I am privileged to be a member of the National Association of Basketball Coaches Congress, a body of approximately 50 coaches throughout the nation.

One of the issues that was discussed during the lunch period was that coaches from other parts of the country may be a little bit upset that they don't have the same privilege. Let me indicate that that is far from the case and the conversations at our congress meetings. The coaches — and I suspect they are no different than all of the coaches in other sports — are very supportive of student-athlete participation and the opportunity to play in championship events. I hope to dispel that misnomer that there are other coaches that would be coming to you saying well, they have something and we do not. That is far from the case. I certainly hope that we will vote to reconsider.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I am not real familiar with the ECAC, but my question would be this: In the thought of reconsidering, are we making an exception for one particular extra opportunity for the majority of schools on the East Coast? In reality, is this legislation only restricted to them? Or can now any part of the country add an extra tournament?

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): If this is adopted, the legislation is going to allow any sponsoring organization that indicates that it will have a season-ending event prior to the first contest date in that sport to sponsor a post-season competition per the exception. It is not targeted to any established event, including the ECAC. It is for any sponsoring organization event.

Mr. Kaiser: So with all due respect to my colleague who said that the coaches won't begin to look at this who don't currently have this, you are incorrect. We will begin to have this throughout the country and it basically means Division III just added an extra week to our playing season.

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): I would just like to clarify that when we did draft this legislation, we did spend a considerable amount of time speaking with other colleagues across the country.

We could have written this to be very specific to ECAC-member schools. We chose not to, because the feedback we got from our colleagues was that it would be regarded as exclusive and limiting and unfair to the rest of the country. So we felt that we could write legislation that was broad and would give the people the opportunity to take advantage of it or not. But we did not want to make this special interest legislation. That was done on purpose.

Dale Knobel (Denison University): I appreciate the support of the membership for the position of the Presidents Council and the Management Council in the original vote on this proposal to defeat it. The proposition has been considered for a long time.

We decided two years after lengthy study on the appropriate length of season. To reconsider this and to make a different decision than we made earlier is a movement in the direction of more. I hope you will vote against

reconsidering this motion and reaffirm the decision that you made earlier today.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 17 was defeated, 201-183-4.]

RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — COMPETITION AGAINST PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

John Schael (Washington University in Saint Louis): I was on the prevailing side of referring Proposal No. 24 back to the Management Council. I would like to make a motion to reconsider No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 24, as presented by the Management Council, would have prohibited subvarsity and varsity teams from competing against high school and preparatory teams. We think this makes a lot of sense.

Also, I don't know how you distinguish between the subvarsity and the varsity athlete. The subvarsity, if they are JV teams or freshmen teams or just all sophomore teams, have the same limitations and have the same compliance issues as all varsity athletes. You don't just treat them differently when it comes to playing against high school or preparatory teams. I think the rationale from the Council is very solid in that subvarsity and varsity teams should be bound by the same prohibition against competition against high school or preparatory school teams. It certainly is a recruiting advantage and a tryout if you are playing your subvarsity teams against high school teams.

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. Just to be clear, we are considering a motion to reconsider the referral of Proposal No. 24 to the committee. The effect would be, if the reconsideration continues, that would set aside that direction to refer to a committee. We would then presumably go on to discuss the merits of the proposal. Are there any other comments on this motion to reconsider?

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 24 was defeated, 190-188-6.]

Chuck Mitrano (Empire 8): I have a quick question on parliamentary issues. We have already made a vote to not reconsider Proposal 17. As a co-sponsor, we would have an interest in splitting that proposal. Is it possible to reconsider Proposal 17 with the notion that that could happen?

Georgana Taggart (College of Mount St. Joseph): No. You cannot reconsider something that has already been reconsidered and defeated.

Mr. Mitrano: Thank you very much.

Mr. Miranda: I am sure the court reporter got that "no." (Laughter) Are there any other motions to reconsider those things that we did in the roll-call voting earlier? Seeing no one moving to a microphone, we can then turn to reconsideration of the paddle votes. Is there anyone who would like to move reconsideration of anything acted on in the paddle votes earlier? It does not appear so. So, with that, I am happy to close the window of reconsideration. Thank you. (Applause)

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Stone: If you will stick with us now for just a few minutes, we are going to adjourn. If you feel like you need to rush out, I would like you to know that we have a few important announcements and comments, but they won't take very long.

I can imagine that you would like to join me in expressing our appreciation to Mike Miranda for the good way he has led us through our business today. Mike, thank you. Just because he did it, he will get to do it next year. (Applause)

I would also like for this deacon's bench up here on my left and your right to stand up and turn around and face you. This is the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Isn't that a great group of people to have in here? (Applause) We are so proud of what you do for the NCAA and the way you represent us. So we would be proud for anybody to know that you are NCAA people.

I also want to say a word of special appreciation to my president colleagues who participate so fully in the Convention. I know that everybody appreciates their good presidential involvement, and I do thank you for that.

I know how busy you are.

I wanted to make just a couple of closing observations. We started the process that led to much of the business of this Convention a couple of years ago when we passed Resolution 66, which was broad enough that I don't think people worried too much about whether they had to negotiate language in it or anything because it passed overwhelmingly. It called for us to look at the future of Division III. We talked today about limitations on membership. We have talked about philosophy. We have talked about rules and regulations. I think the oversight committee kept the faith with you, which was identified at last year's Convention when we got around tables and you participated in the discussion. There was no hidden agenda with any legislation in mind coming out of that.

There is going to be an opportunity to have a dialogue and a conversation with the membership. That has been done at the conference level and the institutional level and all levels of the NCAA, including last year's Convention when we had discussions. I think you have seen that the legislation proposed to you, at least through the Management Council and the Presidents Council, comes out of that conversation and the surveys and is an effort to try to respond to you. The fact that we don't agree on all the legislation does not mean we didn't listen to each other. It means that reasonable people do see these things differently.

As I said to the presidents' group yesterday at our luncheon, when we talk about our reform package, we don't really mean to taint people who don't agree with the results of certain legislation as being anti-reform. We all want to do what is right for the student-athlete, for the good of intercollegiate athletics, for balance, for the integration of athletics into our college missions and for our college athletes into the student body. But we sometimes come up with different results and different answers. But it is important that we keep working on a shared value and the shared purpose, which really is to make sure that there is this balance for the wholly and broadly educated student, and that athletics will always be a part of our program and never a stand-alone piece of entertainment or activity. We will always have it integrated into our campus. You have worked really well at this Convention. Yesterday, several of us at the front here had to try to interpret, what did it mean that we did not need all the time set aside? What did it mean that we did not have a lot of questions and conversation? We wondered whether today we would find out that you were going to dump it all on us, that we would find out that now you wanted to do the talking. In fact, what it has to mean, as far as I am concerned, is you have really processed this material. The communication system has worked pretty well this year in terms of the information you have gotten, but especially what you have done at the conference level. I am so impressed with the way your conferences are functioning in terms of trying to talk to each other. I think you look at the legislation to see whether it is good or bad, and when you come here you are really ready. I think our dispatch of business today reflects that. So I will not take advantage of your good work by filibustering at this point and simply thank you for the good work you have done — not only today but over the last couple of years as we processed our business, as we have been engaged with each other. Now we are really ready to celebrate our 100th anniversary with some real momentum.

I will ask you now if you have any further business before I adjourn the meeting?

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: Mr. Chair, I would like for the members of Division III to give you thanks for what you have done in the last year and a half in guiding us through this process and giving everybody the opportunity to speak, providing the funny part, the good part, the lawyerly part, and we want to thank you for this year and a half. Will you join me in thanking President Stone.

[The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Stone: Thank you very much. Thank you. Now, let's continue our celebration of the 100th anniversary — a Celebration of the Student-Athlete.

Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Nelson: I move we adjourn.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Stone: There is a motion and a second that we adjourn. All in favor will say "aye"; all opposed "no". The motion is approved. We are adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 2 p.m.]



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
Institution	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
America East Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
American University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Appalachian State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arizona State University	N	N	N	N
Arkansas State University	A	N	N	N
Atlantic 10 Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Coast Conference	N	N	N	N
Atlantic Sun Conference	Y	Y		Y
Auburn University	N	N	N	N
Austin Peay State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ball State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baylor University	N	N	N	N
Belmont University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big 12 Conference	N	N	N	N
Big East Conference	N	N		N
Big Sky Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big South Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big Ten Conference	N	N	N	N
Big West Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Birmingham-Southern College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Boise State University	N	N	N	N
Boston College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Boston University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bowling Green State University	N	N	N	N
Bradley University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Brigham Young University	N	N	N	N
Brown University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bucknell University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Butler University	Y	Y	Y	Y
California Polytechnic State University	A	Y	Y	Y
California State University Fresno	N	N	N	N
California State University Fullerton	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University Northridge	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University Sacramento	Y	Y	Y	Y
Campbell University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Canisius College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Michigan University	Y	Y	Y	
Charleston Southern University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clemson University	A	N	N	N



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
Cleveland State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Coastal Carolina University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colgate University	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Charleston (South Carolina)	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of the Holy Cross	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of William and Mary	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colonial Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	Y
Columbia University-Barnard College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conference USA	N	N	N	N
Cornell University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Creighton University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dartmouth College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Davidson College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Delaware State University	N	N	N	N
DePaul University	N	N	N	N
Drake University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Drexel University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duke University	A	Y	Y	Y
Duquesne University	Y	Y	Y	Y
East Tennessee State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Illinois University	A	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Kentucky University	N	N	N	N
Eastern Michigan University	Y	N	N	N
Eastern Washington University	A	Y	Y	Y
Elon University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fairfield University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fairleigh Dickinson University Metropolitan	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida Atlantic University	N	N	N	N
Florida International University	N	N	N	N
Florida State University	N	N	N	N
Fordham University	A	Y	Y	Y
Furman University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gardner-Webb University	Y	Y	Y	Y
George Mason University	Y	Y	Y	N
George Washington University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgetown University	N	N	N	N
Georgia Institute of Technology	N	N	N	N
Georgia Southern University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gonzaga University	Y	Y	Y	Y



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
Hampton University	Y	N	N	N
Harvard University	Y	Y	Y	Y
High Point University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hofstra University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Horizon League	Y	Y	Y	Y
Idaho State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Illinois State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indiana State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indiana University Bloomington	N	N	N	N
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iona College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iowa State University	N	N	N	N
Ivy Group	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jacksonville State University	N	N	N	N
Jacksonville University	Y	Y	Y	Y
James Madison University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kansas State University	N	N	N	N
Kent State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
La Salle University	A	Y	Y	Y
Lafayette College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lamar University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lehigh University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Liberty University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lipscomb University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Long Beach State University	A	N	N	N
Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisiana State University	N	N	N	N
Loyola College (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Loyola Marymount University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Loyola University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Manhattan College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marist College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marquette University	N	N	N	N
Marshall University	N	N	N	N
Mercer University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Michigan State University	N	N	N	N
Mid-American Conference	N	N	N	N
Mid-Continent Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
Middle Tennessee State University	N	N	N	N
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mississippi State University	N	N	N	
Mississippi Valley State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri Valley Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Monmouth University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montana State University-Bozeman	Y	Y	Y	Y
Morehead State University	A	Y	Y	Y
Mount St. Mary's University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mountain West Conference	N	N	N	N
Murray State University	N	Y	Y	N
New Mexico State University	N	N	N	N
Niagara University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nicholls State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Carolina State University	N	N	N	N
Northeast Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeastern University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern Arizona University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwestern State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwestern University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oakland University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio University	A	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Valley Conference	A	Y	Y	Y
Oklahoma State University	N	N	N	N
Old Dominion University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oral Roberts University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oregon State University	N	N	N	N
Pacific-10 Conference	N	N	N	N
Pennsylvania State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pepperdine University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Princeton University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Providence College	N	N	N	N
Purdue University	N	N	N	N
Quinnipiac University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Radford University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rice University	N	N	N	N
Rider University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Robert Morris University	Y	Y	Y	Y



Division I

	2004-21 A Gymnastics	2004-21 B Volleyball	2004-21 C CC/T&F	2004-21 D Soccer
Rutgers State Univ of New Jersey New Brunswick	N	N	N	N
Sacred Heart University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Joseph's University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Louis University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Samford University	A		Y	Y
San Diego State University	N	N	N	N
San Jose State University	N	Y	Y	N
Santa Clara University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Savannah State University	A	N	N	N
Seton Hall University	N	N	N	N
Siena College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeast Missouri State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeastern Conference	N	N	N	N
Southeastern Louisiana University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Methodist University	N	N	N	N
Southern Utah University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southland Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwestern Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Bonaventure University	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Francis College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John's University (New York)	N	N	N	N
St. Mary's College of California	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Peter's College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stanford University	N	Y	Y	N
State University of New York at Binghamton	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stephen F. Austin State University	N	N	N	N
Stetson University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stony Brook University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sun Belt Conference	N	N	N	N
Syracuse University	N	N	N	N
Temple University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tennessee State University	Y	Y	Y	N
Tennessee Technological University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M University College Station	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Christian University	N	N	N	N
Texas State University-San Marcos	N	N	N	N
Texas Tech University	N	N	N	N



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
The Citadel	Y	Y	Y	Y
The Patriot League	Y	Y	Y	Y
Towson University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Troy University	N	N	N	N
U.S. Air Force Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y
U.S. Military Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y
U.S. Naval Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y
University at Albany	Y	Y	Y	Y
University at Buffalo the State University of New York	N	N	N	N
University of Akron	A	Y	N	N
University of Alabama at Birmingham	N	N		N
University of Alabama Tuscaloosa	N	N	N	N
University of Arizona	N	N	N	N
University of Arkansas Fayetteville	N	N	N	N
University of Arkansas Little Rock	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of California Berkeley	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of California Irvine	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of California Los Angeles	N	N	N	N
University of California Riverside	A	Y	Y	Y
University of California Santa Barbara	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Central Florida	N	N	N	N
University of Cincinnati	N	N	N	N
University of Colorado Boulder	N	N	N	N
University of Connecticut	N	N	N	N
University of Dayton	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Delaware	N	N	N	N
University of Denver	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Detroit Mercy	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Evansville	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Florida	N	N	N	N
University of Georgia	N	N	N	N
University of Hartford	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Hawaii Manoa	N	N	N	N
University of Houston	N	N	N	N
University of Illinois at Chicago	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Illinois Champaign	N	N	N	N
University of Iowa	N	N	N	N
University of Kansas	N	N	N	N
University of Kentucky	N	N	N	N
University of Louisville	N	N	N	N



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
University of Maine Orono	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maryland Baltimore County	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maryland College Park	N	N	N	N
University of Massachusetts Amherst	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Memphis	N	N	N	N
University of Miami (Florida)	N	N	N	N
University of Michigan	N	N	N	N
University of Minnesota Twin Cities	N	N	N	N
University of Mississippi	N	N	N	N
University of Missouri Columbia	N	N	N	N
University of Missouri Kansas City	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Montana	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Nebraska Lincoln	N	N	N	N
University of Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Nevada Las Vegas	N	N	N	N
University of New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of New Mexico	N	N	N	N
University of New Orleans	Y	Y	N	A
University of North Carolina Asheville	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	N	Y	N	N
University of North Carolina Charlotte	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Carolina Wilmington	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Texas	N	N	N	N
University of Northern Iowa	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Notre Dame	N	N	N	N
University of Oklahoma	N	N	N	N
University of Oregon	N	N	N	N
University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh	N	N	N	N
University of Portland	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Rhode Island	N	N	N	N
University of Richmond	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of San Diego	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of San Francisco	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of South Alabama	A	N	N	Y
University of South Carolina Columbia	N	N	N	N
University of South Florida	N	N	N	N
University of Southern California	N	N	N	N
University of Southern Mississippi	N	N	N	N



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Tennessee at Martin	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Tennessee Knoxville	N	N	N	N
University of Texas at Arlington	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Texas at Austin	N	N	N	N
University of Texas at El Paso	A	N	N	N
University of Texas at San Antonio	Y	N	Y	N
University of Texas Pan American	A	Y	Y	Y
University of the Pacific	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Toledo	A	Y	N	N
University of Utah	N	N	Y	N
University of Vermont	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Virginia	N	N	N	N
University of Washington	N	N	N	N
University of Wisconsin Green Bay	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin Madison	N	N	N	N
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee	Y	Y	Y	
University of Wyoming	N	N	N	N
Utah State University	N	N	N	N
Valparaiso University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vanderbilt University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Villanova University	N	N	N	N
Virginia Commonwealth University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Virginia Military Institute	Y	Y	Y	Y
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	A	N	N	N
Wagner College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wake Forest University	A	Y	Y	Y
Washington State University	N	N	N	N
West Coast Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia University	N	N	N	N
Western Athletic Conference	N	N	N	N
Western Carolina University	Y	Y	Y	
Western Illinois University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Kentucky University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Michigan University	N	N	N	N
Wichita State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Winthrop University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wofford College	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wright State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Xavier University	Y	Y	Y	Y



Division I

	2004-21 A	2004-21 B	2004-21 C	2004-21 D
	Gymnastics	Volleyball	CC/T&F	Soccer
Yale University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Youngstown State University	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	188	204	202	192
N	111	117	117	125
A	23	0	0	1
Total	322	321	319	318
Total Y+N	299	321	319	317
%Y	62.88%	63.55%	63.32%	60.57%
Pass/Fail	PASS	PASS	PASS	FAIL

100th Annual Convention

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2005-06 NCAA Division II Manual.]

Topical Groupings of Proposed Amendments 100th Annual Convention

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 16	Consent Package
17 through 23	Presidents Council Grouping
24	Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel
25 through 29	Recruiting
30	Eligibility
31 through 32	Financial Aid
33	Awards and Benefits
34 through 38	Playing and Practice Seasons
39 through 40	Administrative

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supported all proposals except for No. 25, which was withdrawn. The SAAC spoke in support of Proposal Nos. 18, 19 and 22, which were adopted, and Nos. 31 and 34, which were defeated.]

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 1 (NO. 2-5) AMATEURISM, RECRUITING, AND AWARDS AND BENEFITS — IDENTIFIED BENEFITS FOR RELATIVES OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES AND STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To change references from “spouse, parents, or family members” to “relatives.”

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.1.4.6, page 65, as follows:

“12.1.1.1.4.6 Expenses for *Parents* **Relatives**/Legal Guardians of Participants in Athletics Competition. Expenses received by the *parents* **relatives** or legal guardians of a participant in athletics competition from a nonprofessional organization sponsoring the competition in excess of actual and necessary travel, room and board expenses, or any entertainment expenses, provided such expenses are made available to the *parents* **relatives** or legal guardians of all participants in the competition.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4.5, page 65, as follows:

“12.1.1.4.5 Exception for *Family* **Relatives** Travel to Olympic Games. A commercial company (other than a professional sports organization) or members of the local community may provide actual and necessary expenses for an individual’s *spouse, parents, relatives* or legal guardians or *other relatives* to attend the Olympic Games in which the individual will participate.”

C. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.3, page 69, as follows:

“12.2.4.3 Negotiations. An individual may request information about professional market value without affecting his or her amateur status. Further, the individual, his or her **relatives** or legal guardians or the institution’s professional sports counseling panel may enter into negotiations with a professional sports organization without the loss of the individual’s amateur status. An individual who retains an agent shall lose amateur status.”

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.2, page 77, as follows:

“13.02.2 Contact. A contact is any face-to-face encounter between a prospect or the prospect’s *parents, relatives* or legal guardian(s) and an institutional staff member or athletics representative during which any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting. Any such face-to-face encounter that is prearranged (e.g., positions himself/herself in a location where contact is possible) or that takes place on the grounds of the prospect’s educational institution or at the site of organized competition or practice involving the prospect or

the prospect's high-school, preparatory school, two-year college or all-star team shall be considered a contact, regardless of whether any conversation occurs. However, an institutional staff member or athletics representative who is approached by a prospect or the prospect's *parents*, relatives or legal guardian(s) at any location shall not use a contact, provided the encounter was not prearranged and the staff member or athletics representative does not engage in any dialogue in excess of a greeting and takes appropriate steps to immediately terminate the encounter."

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.4.1, page 78, as follows:

"13.02.4.1 Permissible Recruitment Activities for Enrolled Student-Athletes:

[13.02.4.1-(a) through 13.02.4.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Official visits. An enrolled student-athlete may participate as a student host during a prospect's official visit to the institution's campus. As a student host, a student-athlete may receive the following:

"(1) A maximum of \$30 for each day of the visit to cover all actual costs of entertaining the prospect (and the prospect's *parents* **relatives, spouse or legal guardians**), excluding the cost of meals and admission to campus athletics events. These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$15 per day for each additional prospect the host entertains.

"In the event that several students host a prospect, the \$30 per day entertainment money may be utilized to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all hosts. Only one student host per prospect may be provided a free meal, if restaurant facilities are used;"

[13.02.4.1-(e)-(2) through 13.02.4.1-(f) unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.9.1, page 79, as follows:

"13.02.9.1 Recruited Prospective Student-Athlete. Actions by staff members or athletics representatives that cause a prospective student-athlete to become a recruited prospective student-athlete at that institution are:

[13.02.9.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Having an arranged, in-person, off-campus encounter with the prospect or the prospect's *parent(s)*, relatives or legal guardian(s); or"

[13.02.9.1-(c) unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.2, page 81, as follows:

"13.1.2.2 General Exceptions. This regulation is not applicable to:

[13.1.2.2-(a) through 13.1.2.2-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Interpreter. An interpreter present during an institution's in-person, off-campus contact with a prospect or the prospect's *parent(s)* **relatives** [or legal guardian(s)], pro-

vided that if the institution is involved in making the arrangements for the use of the interpreter, the interpreter must be a faculty member or a professional interpreter. It is not permissible for the interpreter to be an enrolled student-athlete, a family member of an enrolled student-athlete or a representative of the institution's athletics interests."

[13.1.2.2-(g) through 13.1.2.2-(h) unchanged.]

H. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.4.1, page 82, as follows:

"13.1.3.4.1 Institutional Staff Members. In all sports, institutional staff members may make telephone calls to a prospect [or the prospect's *parents* **relatives** or legal guardian(s)] in accordance with the provisions of this bylaw."

I. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.6, page 83, as follows:

"13.1.3.6 Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls. Institutional staff members may accept collect telephone calls and may use a toll-free (800/888) number to receive telephone calls placed by prospects, prospects' *parents* **relatives** or legal guardian(s) at any time."

J. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.9, pages 84-85, as follows:

"13.1.9 Banquets and Meetings.

"(a) All Sports Other Than Football or Basketball. In sports other than football and basketball, the coach may speak at a meeting or banquet (except for dead periods per Bylaw 13.02.3.4) at a prospect's educational institution without using one of the institution's permissible contacts or evaluations, provided:

[13.1.9-(a)-(1) through 13.1.9-(a)-(2) unchanged.]

"(3) The coach does not have any direct contact with any prospect (or the prospect's *parents* **relatives or legal guardians**) in attendance; and"

[13.1.9-(a)-(4) through 13.1.9-(b)-(2) unchanged.]

K. Bylaws: Amend 13.2.8, page 86, as follows:

"13.2.8 Life-Threatening Injury or Illness. An institution may present a prospective student-athlete with a donation to a charity on behalf of the prospective student-athlete or provide other reasonable tokens of support (e.g., flowers) in the event of the prospect's *family member's* **relative's or legal guardian's** death or life-threatening injury or illness, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI) with the institution, or for those institutions that do not subscribe to the NLI program, a written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

L. Bylaws: Amend 13.3.2.2, page 86, as follows:

"13.3.2.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to all incoming prospects and to prospects' **parents or legal guardians** the NCAA banned drug list (or the NCAA

Web site address at which the list is located) and information about nutritional supplements (See Bylaw 31.2.3.5). The information shall be provided at the earliest practical opportunity (e.g., after the institution's first arranged in-person encounter with the prospect) or upon request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than July 1 before the prospect's initial enrollment at the institution. For a prospect whose recruitment is initiated after July 1, the institution must send the banned drug list and information about nutritional supplements at the earliest opportunity. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

M. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.1, page 91, as follows:

"13.6.5.1 General Restrictions. An institution may provide entertainment, which may not be excessive, on the official visit only for a prospect and the prospect's *parents relatives* [or legal guardian(s)] *or spouse and only* within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. Entertainment and contact by representatives of the institution's athletics interests during the official visit are confined to campus. It is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends (including dates) of a prospect at any time at any site. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the entertainment is \$100 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

N. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.5, page 92, as follows:

"13.6.5.5 Student Host. The institution may provide the following to a student host entertaining a prospect:

"(a) A maximum of \$30 for each day of the visit to cover all actual costs of entertaining the prospect (and the prospect's *parents, relatives or* legal guardians *or spouse*), excluding the cost of meals and admission to campus athletics events. These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$15 per day for each additional prospect the host entertains;"

[13.6.5.5-(b) through 13.6.5.5-(c) unchanged.]

O. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.7.1, page 93, as follows:

"13.6.5.7.1 All Divisions. In all divisions, the cost of actual meals, not to exceed three per day, on the official visit for a

prospect and the prospects *parents*, **relatives** or legal guardian(s) *or spouse* need not be included in the \$30-per-day entertainment expense. A dessert or after-dinner snack at the coach's residence also may be excluded."

P. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.8, page 93, as follows:

"13.6.5.8 Normal Retail Cost. If a boat, snowmobile, recreational vehicle or similar recreational equipment (including those provided by an institutional staff member or a representative of the institution's athletics interests) is used to entertain a prospect or the prospect's *parents* **relatives** or legal guardian(s) *and spouse* the normal retail cost of the use of such equipment shall be assessed against the \$30-per-day entertainment figure; further, if such normal retail cost exceeds the \$30-per-day entertainment allowance, such entertainment may not be provided."

Q. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.6, page 93, as follows:

"13.6.6 Entertainment on Official Visit for *Spouse, Parent Relatives* or Legal Guardian(s) of Prospect. A member institution shall limit entertainment, meals and lodging on the prospect's official visit to a prospect, **and** the prospect's *parents* **relatives** [or legal guardian(s)] *and spouse*. For violations of this bylaw, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time that the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

R. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.7, page 93, as follows:

"13.6.7 Lodging for Additional Persons. Additional persons (e.g., prospect's brother, sister, friend) may stay in the same room as the prospect or *parents, spouse* **relatives** or legal guardian(s) of the prospect, but the institution shall not pay the costs resulting from the additional occupants. The additional occupants shall not be prospects being recruited by the institution."

S. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.2.1.1, page 94, as follows:

"13.7.2.1.1 Meals. An institution may provide a prospect (and the prospect's *parents* **relatives** or legal guardians) with one meal in the institution's on-campus dining facility during an unofficial visit. In addition, an institution may provide a meal in an off-campus dining facility when all on-campus dining facilities are closed."

T. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.3.8, pages 100-101, as follows:

"13.11.3.8 Private Lessons. An institution's golf or tennis coach may teach private golf or tennis lessons to a prospect, provided

the following conditions are met:

[13.11.3.8-(a) through 13.11.3.8-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Fees of the prospect are not paid by individuals or entities other than the prospect’s **relatives** *parents* or legal guardian(s); and”

[13.11.3.8-(f) unchanged.]

U. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.2.2, page 106, as follows:

“13.15.2.2 Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls. Institutional staff members may accept collect telephone calls and may use a toll-free (800/888) number to receive telephone calls placed by prospects, prospects’ *parents* **relatives** or legal guardians at any time.”

V. Bylaws: Amend 16.1.6.2, page 161, as follows:

“16.1.6.2 Established Regional, National or International Awards. It is permissible for an outside organization (other than a professional sports organization) to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to travel to a banquet designed to recognize the individual’s accomplishments as an athlete in order for the student-athlete to receive an established regional, national or international award (permitted by NCAA legislation). The outside organization also may provide actual and necessary expenses for the student-athlete’s *spouse, parents or other relatives* **or legal guardians** to attend the recognition event.”

W. Bylaws: Amend 16.1.6.5, page 161, as follows:

“16.1.6.5 Conference Awards. A conference or its member institutions may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to travel to the conference office or other site to receive a conference award. In addition, the conference may provide actual and necessary expenses for the student-athlete’s *parents* **relatives** (or legal guardians) *and spouse* to attend the presentation of the conference’s male or female “athlete of the year” award to the student-athlete, provided not more than one male and one female student-athlete receive such an award per academic year.”

X. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.1, page 165, as follows:

“16.6.1.1 Expenses for *Spouse/Children* **Relatives** to Postseason Football Game/NCAA Championship. The institution may provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging, meals and expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the *spouse and children* **relatives or legal guardians** of an eligible student-athlete to accompany the student-athlete to a certified postseason football game or an NCAA football championship in which the student-athlete is a participant, and in other sports, to one round (conducted at one site) of any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant.”

Y. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.2, page 165, as follows:

“16.6.1.2 Life-Threatening Injury or Illness. The institution may pay transportation, housing and meal expenses for *parents relatives* (or legal guardians) *and the spouse* of a student-athlete and for the student-athlete’s teammates to be present in situations in which a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness or, in the event of a student-athlete’s death, to provide these expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements.

“16.6.1.2.1 *Family Member Relative* of Student-Athlete. An institution may pay transportation, housing and meal expenses for a student-athlete and the student-athlete’s teammates to be present in situations in which a *family member relative* or legal guardian of the student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness or, in the event of a *family member’s relative’s* or legal guardian’s death, to provide the student-athlete and the student-athlete’s teammates with expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements.”

Z. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.3, page 165, as follows:

“16.6.1.3 Family Lodging. An institution may reserve or secure lodging at any institutional athletics event (e.g., regular season, conference event, postseason) at a reduced or special rate for the *parents relatives* (or legal guardians) *and immediate family members* of a student-athlete who is a participant in the event. It is not permissible for an institution to pay for any portion of the cost of lodging, including any cost associated with reserving or securing lodging.”

AA. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.4, page 166, as follows:

“16.6.1.4 Family Travel to Olympic Games. A commercial company (other than a professional sports organization) or members of the local community may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete’s *spouse, parents, relatives or* legal guardians *or other relatives* to attend the Olympic Games in which the student-athlete will participate. In addition, *family members relatives or legal guardians* of student-athletes may receive nonmonetary benefits provided to the *family members relatives or legal guardians* of all Olympic team members in conjunction with participation in the Olympic Games.”

BB. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.5, page 166, as follows:

“16.6.1.5 Complimentary Admissions to Institutional Awards Banquet. A member institution may provide complimentary admissions to one annual institutional awards banquet for a student-athlete’s *two three* guests *and spouse*, if applicable.”

CC. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.6, page 166, as follows:

“16.6.1.6 Reasonable Refreshments. An institution may provide reasonable refreshments (e.g. soft drinks, snacks) on an occasional basis to *family member(s) relatives* and/or legal guardians of a student-athlete.”

DD. Bylaws: Amend 16.8.2.4, page 169, as follows:

“16.8.2.4 Reimbursement for Travel to Competition. An institution may not reimburse a student-athlete for expenses incurred while driving to an institution’s off-campus competition site, if the parents (or other relatives *or*, **legal guardians, or** friends) accompany the student-athlete to the competition site.”

EE. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1.8, page 170, as follows:

“16.11.1.8 Reasonable Refreshments. An institution may provide student-athletes with reasonable refreshments (e.g., soft drinks, snacks) in conjunction with student-athlete educational and business meetings or in situations in which the institution provides reasonable refreshments on an occasional basis to *family member(s)* **relatives** and/or legal guardians of the student-athlete per Bylaw 16.6.1.6.”

FF. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1.12, page 171, as follows:

“16.11.1.12 Miscellaneous Benefits. An institution may provide or arrange for the following benefits for a student-athlete:

[16.11.1.12-(a) through 16.11.1.12-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) Occasional meals to team members provided by the *family members and* / **relatives** or legal guardians of a student-athlete at any location;

[16.11.1.12-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Reasonable tokens of support and transportation in the event of serious injury, serious illness, or death of a *family member* **relative or legal guardian** and transportation to attend the funeral of any *family member* **relative or legal guardian;**”

[16.11.1.12-(f) through 16.11.1.12-(g) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: NCAA legislation is not consistent in how it refers to “spouse”, “parents” or “family members.” In today’s culture, the family structure is constantly evolving and often does not reflect what has been known as the “traditional family.” Amending the legislation to include such members under the collective umbrella of “relatives” will bring consistency to the legislation since “relatives” of student-athletes or prospective student-athletes may include spouses, children, parents, legal guardians, siblings and others. This change is consistent with the spirit of deregulation.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 2 (NO. 2-8) RECRUITING — CONTACTS AND
EVALUATIONS — OFF-CAMPUS
RECRUITERS**

Intent: To permit all institutional staff members to contact a prospect within 30 miles of campus during the prospect's official visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.1.1, page 80, as follows:

"13.1.2.1.1 Off-Campus Recruiters. An institutional staff member is not permitted to recruit off campus until he or she has been certified on an annual basis as to knowledge of applicable recruiting rules per Bylaw 11.5.1.1. **However, institutional staff members (e.g., faculty members) may contact prospects for recruiting purposes on campus or within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus during the prospect's official visit.** Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: While on a campus visit, a prospect is allowed to travel within a 30-mile radius of the institution for entertainment and to view off-campus facilities. It is sometimes difficult to prohibit contact with other institutional staff members under those circumstances. Furthermore, it is often convenient to schedule prospects' meetings with faculty and other staff members at places that are considered off campus, such as at a local restaurant.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 3 (NO. 2-9) RECRUITING — RECRUITING
MATERIALS — NONATHLETICALLY
RELATED PRINTED RECRUITING
MATERIALS**

Intent: To specify that an institution may provide nonathletically related recruiting materials to a prospect at any time.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, page 87, as follows:

"13.4.1 Printed Recruiting Materials. An institution may not provide **athletically related** recruiting materials (including electronic mail and facsimiles) to a prospect (*including general correspondence related to athletics*) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

"13.4.1.1 Exceptions — Permissible Date. An institution

may provide educational information published by the NCAA (e.g., NCAA Guide for College-Bound Student-Athlete), camp brochures (see Bylaw 12.5.1.7) *and*, questionnaires **and nonathletically related recruiting materials (e.g., institutional admissions publications, academic publications, student services publications)** to a prospect **at any time before September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.**"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: The current regulations placed on recruiting materials' content and the timing of the mailings is premised on cost containment concerns in production and postage. An ancillary concern is the recruiting-equity issue for institutions with varying marketing and mailing budgets who may feel pressure to extend their athletics recruiting budget to mail more elaborate athletics recruiting materials earlier each year, which may result in higher costs. This proposal should not raise issues of recruiting equity. Institutional policy should determine whether the institution may mail nonathletic recruiting materials (e.g., academic and student-service mailers) prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 4 (NO. 2-13) RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISIT —
LIMITATIONS ON OFFICIAL VISIT —
ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR
OFFICIAL VISIT — STATE-
ADMINISTERED ACT**

Intent: To permit an institution to provide an official visit to a prospective student-athlete who presents scores from a state-administered ACT.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.1.2.3.1, page 90, as follows:

"13.6.1.2.3.1 PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT Score. A member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a high-school or preparatory-school prospect who has not presented the institution with a score from a PSAT, an SAT, a PLAN or an ACT test taken on a national testing date under national testing conditions, **or an ACT test taken on a state testing date under state testing conditions.** The score must be presented in writing through a testing-agency document or on a high-school (or college) academic transcript (official or unofficial) or through the use of the applicable testing agency's automated-voice system. A foreign or learning-disabled prospect who requires a special administration of the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT may present such a score on the approval of the appropriate academic requirements committee."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Currently, a member institution may not provide an official (paid) visit to a high-school or preparatory prospective student-athlete who has not presented the institution with a score from the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT taken on a national testing date under national testing conditions. Statistics provided by ACT indicate that state tests accurately reflect the population of college-bound and noncollege-bound students who are required to take the state test. Additionally, scores achieved on state tests are not higher than those from tests administered on national testing dates. Allowing prospective student-athletes to use a state-administered ACT for purposes of satisfying the official visit legislation will reduce bureaucracy in that prospects will not be required to take another exam on a national testing date.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 5 (NO. 2-16) RECRUITING — HIGH-SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Intent: To eliminate legislation affecting the eligibility of student-athletes who compete in high-school football or basketball all-star games; further, to specify that an institution is prohibited from making its facilities available for a high-school all-star game unless specified conditions are satisfied.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.3.3, page 100, as follows:

“13.11.3.3 Activities Not Involving Institution’s Staff. The use of a member institution’s facilities for a **high-school all-star game or other** physical activities by a group that includes prospects shall not be considered a tryout, provided the institution’s athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in the conduct, promotion or administration of the activity (other than activities incidental to supervising the use of the facilities) and are subject to all applicable NCAA recruiting legislation.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6, page 134, as follows:

“*14.6 HIGH-SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES, EFFECTS ON ELIGIBILITY. A student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if, after completion of high-school eligibility in the student-athlete’s sport and before the student-athlete’s high-school graduation, the student-athlete competes in more than two all-star football contests or two all-star basketball contests. (See Bylaw 30.2.1.1 for definition of high-school all-star contest.)*”

C. Administrative: Amend 30.2, pages 301-302, as follows:

“*30.2 ALL-STAR CONTESTS*”

“30.2.1 High School Football and Basketball. As provided in Bylaw 14.6, a student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if, after completion of high-school eligibility in the student-athlete’s sport and before the student-athlete’s high-school graduation, the student-athlete competes in more than two all-star football contests or two all-star basketball contests.

“30.2.1.1 High-School All-Star Contest Defined. A high-school all-star contest is any contest in the sport of football or basketball that meets the following criteria:

- “(a) The teams participating in the contest involve individuals who have completed their high school eligibility in the sport and have not yet enrolled in and attended classes during a regular term at a collegiate institution;*
- “(b) The contest is scheduled and publicized in advance;*
- “(c) The competition is sponsored and promoted by an individual, organization or agency; and*
- “(d) The individuals are selected for participation in the contest on an invitational basis and have not competed together previously as members of a team that played a regular schedule of games in an organized recreation or interscholastic program.*

“30.2.1.2 Contests Not Considered High-School All-Star Competition. Contests conducted under the criteria listed in Bylaw 30.2.1.1 shall not be considered all-star competition for purposes of Bylaw 14.6 if one or more of the following conditions is applicable:

- “(a) The contest occurs within a framework of a regularly scheduled recreational program involving solely participants from the community in which the sponsor is located;*
- “(b) The competition is limited solely to participants from the community in which the sponsor is located and no revenue, including gate receipts, concessions, program sales or contributions, is generated from the contest;*
- “(c) The competition is scheduled within the framework of an established cultural exchange program involving other educational activities; or*
- “(d) The contest is scheduled in conjunction with developmental competition sponsored by the national governing body of amateur basketball (USA Basketball) or an active member thereof.*

“30.2.1.3 Multiple Competition (Tournaments). Multiple competition (e.g., tournaments) involving more than one contest or two teams will be considered high-school all-star competition if the specific criteria in Bylaw 30.2.1.1 (subject to the conditions in Bylaw 30.2.1.2) are applicable. Each

game conducted under such circumstances would be considered a high-school all-star contest.

“30.2.1.4 Facility Use for High-School All-Star Games. An institution is prohibited from making its facilities available for a high school all-star game unless the conditions specified in Bylaw 13.12.3.3 are met.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Current legislation affecting the eligibility of student-athletes who compete in high-school all-star games applies only to football and basketball student-athletes. Eliminating the by-laws brings parity to all student-athletes with regard to high-school all-star contests and alleviates the difficulty in monitoring and enforcing the current rule. Additionally, the proposed change furthers the goal of deregulation.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 6 (NO. 2-17) RECRUITING — TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS — PRIVATE LESSONS — EQUESTRIAN

Intent: To permit women’s equestrian coaches to give private lessons to prospects, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.3.8, pages 100-101, as follows:

“13.11.3.8 Private Lessons. An institution’s **equestrian**, golf or tennis coach may teach private **equestrian**, golf or tennis lessons to a prospect, provided the following conditions are met:”

[13.11.3.8-(a) through 13.11.3.8-(f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Permitting equestrian coaches to provide lessons would help foster interest in the emerging sport, encourage equestrian participants to remain in competitive equestrian and provide them with positive role models through teachers and coaches, many of who are women.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 7 (NO. 2-18) RECRUITING — SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS — STUDENT-ATHLETE EMPLOYMENT IN OWN INSTITUTION’S CAMP OR CLINIC

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that the director of athletics (or his or her designee) must give prior approval to the student-athlete’s employment arrangement in the institution’s own camp or clinic.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.1.2, page 102, as follows:

“13.12.2.1.2 Employment in Own Institution’s Camp or Clinic. A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ its student-athletes as counselors in camps or clinics, *subject to the following conditions provided*

“(a) ~~T~~the student-athletes **shall do** not participate in organized practice activities other than during the institution’s playing season in the sport (see Bylaw 17.1.1).; **and**

“(b) *The member institution’s director of athletics must give prior approval to the student-athlete’s employment arrangement.*”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Obtaining prior approval for a student-athlete’s employment in the institution’s own camp or clinic is not an effective monitoring requirement, as there are no eligibility requirements for student-athletes to be employed in an institution’s camp or clinic. Specifically, all student-athletes are eligible to be employed in camps or clinics and, therefore, the need to screen a potential camp employee (i.e., give prior approval) is not necessary. Further, there are more effective monitoring requirements in other legislative bylaws that apply to a student-athlete’s employment in an institutional camp or clinic. Per these requirements, institutions are required to ensure that student-athletes are paid the going rate for work actually performed, and that employment is not based on athletics reputation or skill. In addition, playing and practice season regulations prohibit the conduct of practice activities outside the playing and practice season. Institutional monitoring is sufficient to protect against impermissible practice activities occurring during institutional camps or clinics. For these reasons, student-athlete employment in institutional camps or clinics is adequately monitored and the prior approval requirement is unnecessary and cumbersome.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 8 (NO. 2-19) RECRUITING — PRECOLLEGE EXPENSES — USE OF INSTITUTION’S FACILITY

Intent: To permit a state high-school association to use an institution’s facilities to host state high-school championship events at a reduced rate.

Bylaws: Amend 13.15.1 by adding new 13.15.1.5, page 105, as follows:

“13.15.1 Prohibited Expenses. An institution or a representative of its athletics interests shall not offer, provide or arrange financial assistance, directly or indirectly, to pay (in whole or in part) the costs of

the prospect's educational or other expenses for any period before his or her enrollment or so the prospect can obtain a postgraduate education. For violations of Bylaw 13.15 in which the value of the benefit received directly by the prospective student-athlete is \$100 or less, the eligibility of the prospective student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the prospective student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. However, the prospective student-athlete shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of receipt of the direct impermissible benefit until the prospective student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the prospective student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.

[13.15.1.1 through 13.15.1.4 unchanged.]

“13.15.1.5 State High-School Association Use of Member Institution's Facilities. An institution may permit a state high-school association to use its facilities to host state high-school championship events at a reduced rate.”

[13.15.1.5 through 13.15.1.6 renumbered as 13.15.1.6 through 13.15.1.7, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Currently, an institution may charge a reduced rate when it is conducting or jointly sponsoring a high-school, preparatory-school or two-year college contest in accordance with NCAA legislation. If the institution chooses not to be involved in the conduct or sponsoring of the event, it is not permitted to provide a reduced rate. The current restrictions actually encourage greater involvement by institutions in order to provide a financial benefit to high schools/two-year colleges. This proposal seeks to bring some conformity between various interpretations and legislation by permitting an exception specific to state high-school associations to use a member institution's facilities at a reduced cost, regardless of the institution's level of involvement with the event. This would maintain the intent of the legislation to prevent institutions from making direct or indirect financial contributions to a prospect's educational institution, as any benefit would be to the state association and not a specific high school or prospect.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 9 (NO. 2-21) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — TEST-SCORE REQUIREMENT — STATE-ADMINISTERED ACT EXAMINATION

Intent: To specify that a state-administered ACT examination may be used to meet the initial-eligibility test-score requirement.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3, page 121, as follows:

“14.3.1.3 Test-Score Requirements. The minimum required SAT or ACT score (see Bylaw 14.3.1.1) must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing, *state testing* (e.g., *Colorado, Illinois*) or regional testing dates] **except that a state-administered ACT examination may be used to meet the test-score requirement.**

[14.3.1.3.1 unchanged.]

“14.3.1.3.2 Combined Test Scores. For students using the SAT examination, the highest scores achieved on the verbal and mathematics sections of the SAT from two different national testing dates may be combined in determining whether the student has met the minimum test-score requirements. For students using the ACT examination, the highest scores achieved on the individual subtests of the ACT from more than one national testing date **or state-administered examination** may be combined in determining whether the student’s sum score has met the minimum test-score requirement.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Statistics provided by ACT indicate that the state tests are accurately reflecting the population of college-bound and noncollege-bound students who are required to take the state tests and that overall scores achieved through state testing are not higher than those from tests administered on national testing dates. Additionally, when prospective student-athletes have been required, through the waiver process, to take another ACT on a national testing date, the scores on both tests are generally similar. Allowing state-administered tests will benefit prospective student-athletes by eliminating the bureaucracy of the waiver process or retaking of the test.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 10 (NO. 2-22) ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFER REGULATIONS — CONDITIONS AFFECTING TRANSFER STATUS

Intent: To clarify that a student’s physical presence on campus does not invoke transfer status, provided the student does not actually attend a class; further, to specify that the receipt of athletically related institutional financial aid while attending a summer term, summer school or summer-orientation program invokes transfer status.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2, page 129, as follows:

“14.5.2 Conditions Affecting Transfer Status. A transfer student is an individual who transfers from a collegiate institution after having met any one of the following conditions at that institution:

“(a) The student was officially registered and enrolled in a minimum, full-time program of studies in any quarter or semester of an academic year, as certified by the registrar or admissions office, provided the student was present at the institution on the opening day of classes;

[14.5.2-(b) through 14.5.2-(g) relettered as 14.5.2-(a) through 14.5.2-(f), unchanged.]

*“(h g) The student received **athletically related** institutional financial aid while attending a summer term, summer school or summer-orientation program (see Bylaw 15.2.7).”*

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Currently, a registered and enrolled student's mere physical presence on campus invokes transfer status, even if he or she did not attend class. This proposal recognizes that the conditions triggering transfer status should be consistent with the conditions that start the 10-semester/15-quarter limit and, accordingly, that a student's presence on campus should not trigger transfer status if the student does not actually attend a class. Additionally, this proposal furthers the principles of student-athlete well being by linking a student-athlete's transfer status to the receipt of athletically related institutional aid during the summer as opposed to institutional aid.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 11 (NO. 2-25) FINANCIAL AID — DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS — EXEMPTED INSTITUTIONAL AID

Intent: To permit private institutions to exempt out-of-state tuition waivers from counting as institutional financial aid.

Bylaws: Amend 15.02.4.3, page 145, as follows:

“15.02.4.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance, or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

[15.02.4.3-(a) through 15.02.4.3-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) For a public institution, oOut-of-state tuition waivers awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability;”

[15.02.4.3-(d) and 15.02.4.3-(e) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: The Division II membership consists of private and public institutions. Private institutions have offered out-of-state tuition waivers similar to the waivers offered at public institu-

tions. This proposal brings consistency to the tuition waiver process at all member institutions.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 12 (NO. 2-27) FINANCIAL AID — EQUIVALENCY
SPORTS — MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY
LIMITS — WOMEN’S RUGBY**

Intent: In women’s rugby, to establish a maximum equivalency financial aid limit of 12.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.2.1.2, page 155, as follows:

“15.5.2.1.2 Women’s Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per Bylaw 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following women’s sports:

“**Rugby12”**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Women’s rugby was recently established as an emerging sport for women. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a maximum equivalency limitation for the sport. Information related to rugby was reviewed, including the typical squad size, the reasonable number of participants required for practice, competition and injury information. Based on this information and a comparison with other sports, a limit of 12 grants-in-aid is appropriate. Because women’s rugby is a National Collegiate championships sport, it is necessary that the equivalency limit remain consistent among the divisions for purposes of competitive equity.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 13 (NO. 2-29) AWARDS AND BENEFITS —
CONFERENCE AWARDS — EXPENSES**

Intent: To permit a conference to pay the actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete’s relatives to attend a conference academic awards presentation.

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.6.5, page 161, as follows:

“16.1.6.5 Conference Awards. A conference or its member institutions may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to travel to the conference office or other site to receive a conference award. In addition, the conference may provide actual and necessary expenses for the student-athlete’s *parents (or legal guardians) and spouse* **relatives** to attend the presentation of the conference’s male or female “athlete of the year” award to the student-athlete, provided not more than one male and one female student-athlete receive such an award per academic year. **The conference may also provide actual and necessary ex-**

penses for the student-athlete's relatives to attend the presentation of conference academic awards to the student-athlete, provided the academic awards are presented in recognition of outstanding academic achievement."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Currently, a conference may provide expenses for a student-athlete's spouse, parents or legal guardians to attend the annual conference athlete-of-the-year award presentation. That legislation, however, is not broad enough to include expenses for relatives to travel to a conference academic awards presentation. Because the membership has recognized the appropriateness of providing actual and necessary expenses to attend the athlete-of-the-year presentation, it is consistent to permit a student-athlete's relatives to attend presentations in recognition of a student-athlete's outstanding academic achievement.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 14 (NO. 2-32) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — SWIMMING AND DIVING — OUT OF SEASON ACTIVITIES

Intent: In swimming and diving, to specify that outside the playing season, a student-athlete may be involved with in-pool conditioning activities and swimming-specific equipment may be used.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2.2, page 181, as follows:

"17.1.5.2.2 Conditioning Activities. Conditioning drills per Bylaw 17.1.5.2 that may simulate game activities are permissible, provided no offensive or defensive alignments are set up and no equipment related to the sport is used. In the *sport of ice hockey*, a student-athlete may be involved in on-ice conditioning activities, provided no equipment other than skates is used. **In swimming and diving, a student-athlete may be involved with in-pool conditioning activities and swimming-specific equipment (e.g., starting blocks, kickboards, pull buoys) may be used.**"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Limiting the use of specialized swimming equipment such as starting blocks, kickboards, pull buoys, and paddles may reduce the effectiveness of the eight hours for conditioning activities the proposal allows. This proposal permits the use of equipment necessary for effective in-water conditioning.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 15 (NO. 2-37) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASON — ROWING — LIGHTWEIGHT ROWING

Intent: To permit an institution that sponsors a lightweight rowing program to apply the playing and practice season provisions independently from its open rowing program.

Bylaws: Amend 17.17, page 219, as follows:

“17.17 ROWING, WOMEN’S. Regulations for computing the rowing playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1 and 17-2.) **The following regulations apply independently to open and lightweight rowing programs.**”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Women’s rowing was declared an emerging sport in the mid 1990’s and, in 1998, it became an NCAA championship sport, becoming a Division II championship sport in 2002. The championship does not include participants who race in lightweight rowing events. On campuses that support both teams, open and lightweight, the programs operate separately, with different coaches and different student-athletes practicing and competing at different times. NCAA rules should therefore specify that the limits on open women’s rowing do not apply to lightweight women’s rowing.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 16 (NO. 2-38) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASON — SKIING

Intent: To permit an institution that sponsors both Alpine and Nordic skiing to declare separate playing and practice seasons.

Bylaws: Amend 17.19.1, page 224, as follows:

“17.19.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in skiing shall be limited to a 144-day season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per Bylaw 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur. **An institution that sponsors both Alpine and Nordic skiing may declare separate playing and practice seasons.**”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Alpine and Nordic skiing are considered the same sport by

NCAA rules; however, the Alpine and Nordic skiers do not practice together or are they on the same schedule. Much of the scheduling is weather dependent. Providing the teams the flexibility to schedule separate playing and practice seasons will allow them to make adjustments as needed. Each student-athlete will continue to have the same limitations relating to number of contests and countable athletically related activities. Division I recently adopted this change and since skiing is a National Collegiate Championship sport, it is important for Division II to be consistent with the Division I playing and practice season regulations.

Action: Adopted.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 17 (NO. 2-1) INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL — SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION — FAILURE TO COMPLETE**

Intent: To specify that an institution that fails to complete the self-study report within the five-year time period shall be placed on probation and forfeit enhancement funds; further, to specify that institutions that fail to complete the self-study report during the probationary year shall be subject to a \$1,000 fine, forfeit enhancement funds, not eligible for NCAA championships and placed on restricted membership status.

Constitution: Amend 6.3.1 by adding new 6.3.1.1, page 54, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“6.3.1 Self-Study Report. Institutions shall conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of their intercollegiate athletics programs at least once every five years, using the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG). The report of the self-study and supporting documentation shall be available for examination on request by an authorized representative of the Association. Subjects covered by the self-study shall include:

[6.3.1-(a) through 6.3.1-(i) unchanged.]

“6.3.1.1 Failure to Complete Self-Study Report. Institutions failing to complete the self-study report within the five-year time period shall be placed on probation for one year pursuant to Bylaw 20.3.5.1.2 and shall not be eligible to receive Division II Enhancement Funds proceeds. An institution that fails to complete the self-study report during the probationary year shall be fined \$1,000, placed on restricted membership status pursuant to Bylaw 20.3.5.1.2.2, shall not be eligible to receive Division II Enhancement Funds proceeds and shall not be eligible for NCAA championships competition in all sports. In order for an institution to be re-

moved from probation or restricted membership status, the institution must supply the Membership Committee with a complete self-study report including the institution's action plan. The Membership Committee may remove an institution from probation or restricted membership status by a two-thirds vote of the Membership Committee members present and voting. A notice of any action taken by the Membership Committee shall be given in writing to the chief executive officer of an institution."

[6.3.1.1 renumbered as 6.3.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA Constitution requires an institution to conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of its intercollegiate athletics program at least once every five years. During the last two years, over 30 institutions have failed to complete its self-study report within the five-year requirement. The self-study report is a vital component of membership and was established to assist an institution with institutional control issues. Currently, there is not a legislative penalty structure to address an institution's failure to conduct and complete the self-study report within the five-year requirements. This proposal places an institution on probation for failure to complete the self-study report for one year and the institution is not eligible to receive Division II Enhancement Funds. In addition, if the institution fails to complete the ISSG during the probationary period, this proposal establishes a fine of \$1,000 and places an institution on restricted membership status.

Action: Adopted, 247-4-1.

***NO. 18 (NO. 2-2) ETHICAL CONDUCT — UNETHICAL CONDUCT**

Intent: To specify that unethical conduct shall include the knowing involvement in providing a student-athlete a banned substance, impermissible supplement, or medications contrary to the medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports medicine practice, or state or federal law.

Bylaws: Amend 10.1, page 57, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"10.1 UNETHICAL CONDUCT. Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or a current or former institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:

[10.1-(a) through 10.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Knowingly furnishing the NCAA or the individual's institution false or misleading information concerning the individ-

ual's involvement in or knowledge of matters relevant to a possible violation of an NCAA regulation; or

“(e) Receipt of benefits by an institutional staff member for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or a representative of an agent or advisor (e.g., “runner”); or

“(f) **Knowingly providing a student-athlete with a banned substance, impermissible supplement, or medications contrary to medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports medicine practice, or state or federal law.**”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation does not specify that the act of providing impermissible substances (e.g., prescription drugs) that impact athletics performance is an institutional violation. This proposal will clarify that such an egregious act violates the Association's ethical conduct bylaw, since it is contrary to the health and safety of student-athletes. This proposal would not apply to student-athletes with a documented medical history demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug.

Action: Adopted, 257-0-0.

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-4) AMATEURISM — GENERAL
REGULATION — VALIDITY OF
AMATEUR STATUS — PROSPECTIVE OR
TRANSFER STUDENT-ATHLETE**

Intent: To require NCAA certification of the amateur status of any prospective student-athlete (including two-year and four-year transfers) initially enrolling at an NCAA Division II institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1 by adding new 12.1.1, pages 64-67, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“12.1 GENERAL REGULATIONS.

“12.1.1 **Validity of Amateur Status.** As a condition and obligation of membership, it is the responsibility of an institution to determine the validity of the information on which the amateur status of a prospective student-athlete (e.g., including a two-year and four-year college transfer initially enrolling at an NCAA Division II institution) is based. An institution is responsible for notifying the NCAA when it receives additional information, or otherwise has cause to believe, that a prospective or transfer student-athlete's amateur status that has been previously certified has been jeopardized (See Bylaw 14.01.3).

“12.1.1.1 Amateurism Certification Clearinghouse. An institution shall utilize an amateurism clearinghouse approved by the Executive Committee to determine the validity of the information on which the amateur status of a student-athlete is based.

“12.1.1.1.1 Participation Before Certification — Recruited and Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. If a recruited or nonrecruited student-athlete reports for athletics participation before the student-athlete’s amateur status has been certified, the student-athlete may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days, provided the student-athlete is enrolled full time or has been accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student. After this 45-day period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as an amateur (as certified by the NCAA Amateurism Clearinghouse) to continue practicing or to compete.”

[12.1.1 through 12.1.2 renumbered as 12.1.2 through 12.1.3, unchanged.]

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.01, page 107, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“14.01 General Principles.

“[14.01.1 through 14.01.2 unchanged.]

“14.01.3 Compliance with Other NCAA and Conference Legislation. To be eligible to represent an institution in intercollegiate athletics competition, a student-athlete shall be in compliance with all applicable provisions of the constitution and bylaws of the Association and all rules and regulations of the institution and the conference(s), if any, of which the institution is a member. Specific attention is called to legislation affecting eligibility in the following areas.

“14.01.3.1 Amateurism. A student-athlete shall not be eligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if the individual takes or has taken pay, or has accepted the promise of pay in any form, for participation in that sport, or if the individual has violated any of the other regulations related to amateurism set forth in Bylaw 12 (**See Bylaw 12.1.1**).”

[Remainder of 14.01 unchanged.]

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 21.7.6.5.2, page 295-296, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“21.7.6.5.2 Duties. The Committee shall:

[21.7.6.5.2-(a) through -21.7.6.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Review and consider legislative issues of those portions of the Association’s constitution and bylaws that relate to the principles governing financial aid and amateurism, professional sports relations, recruiting, personnel limitations, and playing and practice seasons; *and*

“(f) Review and consider issues regarding rules education and compliance resources; **and**

“(g) **Determine facts related to the certification of amateur status per Bylaw 12.01.1.**”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006, for all final certifications for student-athletes initially enrolling at a Division II institution on or after August 1, 2007.

Rationale: This proposal, which creates an amateurism clearinghouse, is designed to address the membership’s concerns about amateurism issues related to both international and domestic prospects. This proposal will require member institutions to use the clearinghouse to certify the amateur status of any prospective student-athlete, (including two-year or four-year transfers from non NCAA institutions) initially enrolling at an NCAA Division II institution. The amateurism clearinghouse will assist in maintaining competitive equity in recruiting and promoting student-athlete well-being. A centralized clearinghouse for amateurism issues will ensure that consistent information is gathered for each prospective student-athlete; thus, no institution has an advantage over another based on resources available (e.g., staffing, funding) to investigate the prospect’s situation. The amateurism clearinghouse will make certification decisions for all student-athletes, both domestic and international, prior to initial participation in intercollegiate athletics at a Division II member institution, which should allow institutions to be more fiscally responsible in the recruiting process.

Action: Adopted, 245-9-0.

**NO. 20 (NO. 2-6) AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL
ACTIVITIES — STUDENT-ATHLETES
NAME, PICTURE OR LIKENESS**

Intent: To permit the name, picture or likeness of a student-athlete to be used in any institutional, charitable, educational or non-profit promotion that involves a commercial entity, including media entities, under specified conditions.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1.1, page 71, as follows:

“12.5.1.1 Institutional, Charitable, Educational or Nonprofit Promotions. A member institution or recognized entity thereof (e.g., fraternity, sorority or student government organization), a member conference or a noninstitutional charitable, educational or nonprofit agency may use a student-athlete’s name, picture or appearance to support its charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete’s participation in intercollegiate athletics, provided the following conditions are met:

“(a) The student-athlete receives written approval to participate

from the *director of athletics institution's chancellor or president (or his or her designee)*, subject to the limitations on participants in such activities as set forth in Bylaw 17;

- “(b) The specific activity or project in which the student-athlete participates does not involve cosponsorship, advertisement or promotion by a commercial agency *other than through the reproduction of the sponsoring company's officially registered regular trademark or logo on printed materials such as pictures, posters or calendars. The company's emblem, name, address and telephone number may be included with the trademark or logo. Personal names, messages and slogans (other than an officially registered trademark) are prohibited except as follows:*

“(1) **Identification (e.g., graphics, voice over, on-screen text) of the commercial entity must explain the commercial entity's affiliation with the permissible entity (e.g., entity is the official sponsor of the institution/event);**

“(2) **The appearance or description of the commercial product(s)/service(s) and/or the commercial entity's logo(s) may be included but may not exceed 25 percent of the total promotional activity. Further, language or action included in the promotion may not directly encourage the use or purchase of the commercial product or service (e.g., “drink this product”) with which the commercial entity is associated;**

- “(c) *The name or picture of a student-athlete with remaining eligibility may not appear on an institution's printed promotional item (e.g., picture, poster, calendar, compact-disc presentation) that includes a reproduction of a product with which a commercial entity is associated, if the commercial entity's officially registered regular trademark or logo also appears on the item;*”

[12.5.1.1-(d) through 12.5.1.1-(i) relettered as 12.5.1.1-(c) through 12.5.1.1-(h), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: While technological developments have increased the opportunities for multimedia promotions, current legislation has limited the potential to partner with commercial entities to advance initiatives such as educational mission and the value of the student-athlete experience. This proposal would increase an institution's flexibility to engage in various types of promotions while maintaining the current restrictions on the types of entities (i.e., institutional, charitable, educational, nonprofit) that may use the

name or likeness of a student-athlete. The requirement to have the institution's chancellor or president approve these promotional activities is not intended to have the chancellor or president approve every promotional activity. However, the expectation is that the chancellor or president will oversee the activities to ensure that the obligation to protect the student-athlete from exploitation is balanced with the institution's need to enhance the mutual benefits derived from a relationship with corporate entities. Both the requirement to identify the relationship between the commercial and the permissible entities and the 25 percent limitation serves to maintain the focus of the promotion on the permissible entity. Finally, the principle of amateurism is sustained through precluding any encouragement of the purchase or use of the product and the prohibition on any direct endorsement of a student-athlete.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 21 (NO. 2-11) RECRUITING — RECRUITING ADVERTISEMENTS — SHARED HOME FACILITY

Intent: To permit an institution to advertise and upgrade its home facility even if that facility is also the home facility for prospective student-athletes (e.g., high-school football stadium).

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.4.1 by adding new 13.4.4.1.1, page 87, as follows:

“13.4.4.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publications of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member institution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted. Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospects (e.g., recruiting publications) for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the institution. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

“13.4.4.1.1 Exception - Shared Home Facility. A member institution may advertise and upgrade its home facility even if that facility is also the home facility for prospective student-athletes (e.g., high-school football stadium).”

[13.4.4.1.1 through 13.4.4.1.2 renumbered as 13.4.4.1.2 through 13.4.4.1.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.2 by adding new 13.15.2.4, page 106, as follows:

“13.15.2 Permissible Expenses

[13.15.2.1 through 13.15.2.3 unchanged.]

“13.15.2.4 Advertisements and Upgrades for Shared Home Facility. A member institution may advertise and upgrade its home facility even if that facility is also the home facility for prospective student-athletes (e.g., high-school football stadium).”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Current legislation does not permit member institutions to make any type of improvement that benefits a high-school athletics program. Therefore, an institution whose home facility is also the home facility for a high school must seek permission from the Administrative Review Subcommittee (ARS) to advertise or upgrade its facility. An institution that wishes to share costs at its home facility should not be penalized. The purpose behind shared resources is not to gain a recruiting advantage; rather, it amounts to good business practice for many institutions. If an institution has an opportunity to share costs at its home facility, it should be permitted to do so.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 22 (NO. 2-23) ELIGIBILITY — FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION — FINAL SEASON OF COMPETITION OR FINAL TWO FULL-TIME SEMESTERS OR THREE FULL-TIME QUARTERS**

Intent: To specify as a condition of the one-time transfer exception that a student, who has one season of competition remaining in his or her sport or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining in which to complete his or her eligibility and has not earned a baccalaureate degree, shall have satisfactorily completed an average of 12-semester or 12-quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each term of full-time attendance, at any collegiate institution, with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.10, page 134, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“14.5.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution, and all of the following conditions are met (for graduate students, see also Bylaw 14.1.9.1):

[14.5.5.3.10-(a) through 14.5.5.3.10-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) A student who has one season of competition remaining in his or her sport or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining in which to complete his or her eligibility and who has not earned a

baccalaureate degree, shall have satisfactorily completed an average of 12-semester or 12-quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each term of full-time attendance, at any collegiate institution, with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: The NCAA Division II Presidents Council directed the Academic Requirements Committee to review the current four-year college transfer requirements in light of recent concerns regarding the perception that to be successful in Division II, a program should recruit transfer student-athletes. The Management Council believes that the academic concerns relate to those student-athletes transferring late in their collegiate enrollment. This proposal amends the current one-time transfer exception by requiring a transfer student-athlete, who has one season of competition remaining in the sport or two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters remaining and has not earned a baccalaureate degree, to have completed an average of 12-semester or 12-quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each term of full-time attendance at any collegiate institution. In addition, the student-athlete must also present a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 in the transferable credits. These additional requirements will ensure that a transfer student-athlete, who uses the one-time transfer exception, is making appropriate academic progress. Further, the proposal maintains that a transfer student-athlete must have been eligible at his/her previous institution and does not apply to student-athletes who are transferring to pursue a graduate or professional degree.

Action: Adopted, 247-10-1.

***NO. 23 (NO. 2-24) ELIGIBILITY AND CHAMPIONSHIPS —
PENALTY STRUCTURE AND
CHAMPIONSHIP SELECTION PROCESS**

Intent: To establish an appropriate penalty structure as part of the enforcement and championship selection process as follows: (1) Clarify that all decisions by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee are final; (2) Amend the Philosophy Statement to indicate championships are for eligible student-athletes; (3) Define nullification; (4) Establish an appeals process for nullifications; (5) Create an eligibility verification form; (6) Establish nullification of contests as part of the championship selection criteria; and (7) Clarify the process to appeal secondary infractions cases.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.11, pages 137-138, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“14.11 INELIGIBILITY

[14.11.1 unchanged.]

“14.11.2 Ineligibility Resulting from Recruiting Violation. An institution shall not enter a student-athlete (as an individual or as a member of the team) in any intercollegiate competition, if it is acknowledged by the institution or established through the Association’s enforcement procedures that the institution or representative(s) of its athletics interests violated the Association’s legislation in recruiting of the student-athlete. The institution may appeal to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee for restoration of the student-athlete’s eligibility as provided in Bylaw 14.12, if it concludes that circumstances warrant restoration.”

[14.11.2.1 renumbered as 14.11.1.2, unchanged.]

[14.11.3 renumbered as 14.11.1.1, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 14.11.4 renumbered as 14.11.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.2, page 256, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“18.4.1.2 Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee Authority. The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee shall have *initial final* authority to determine all matters pertaining to the eligibility of student-athletes competing in the various NCAA championships *and to act upon all appeals concerning the eligibility of student-athletes* submitted by member institutions (see Bylaw 14.12).”

C. Bylaws: Amend 19.5.1, pages 263-264, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“19.5.1 Penalties for Secondary Violations. The vice-president for enforcement services, on approval by the chair or another member of the Committee on Infractions designated by the chair, or the committee may determine that no penalty is warranted in a secondary case, that an institutional or conference-determined penalty is satisfactory or, if appropriate, impose a penalty. Among the disciplinary measures are:

[19.5.1-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Forfeiture of contests in which an ineligible student-athlete participated. Per Bylaw 18.1 and Administrative Regulation 31.3.3, the Championships Committee shall nullify each contest in which a student-athlete competes while ineligible regardless of whether forfeiture is required.

[19.5.1-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) An institutional fine for each violation, with the monetary penalty ranging in total from \$500 up to \$5,000, except when an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA

championship or other postseason competition in which case the \$5,000 limit shall not apply;"

[19.5.1-(e) through 19.5.1-(i) unchanged.]

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 20.10, page 277, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

"20.10 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS. In addition to the purposes and fundamental policy of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, as set forth in Constitution 1, members of Division II believe that a well-conducted intercollegiate athletics program, based on sound educational principles and practices, is a proper part of the educational mission of a university or college and that the educational welfare of the participating student-athlete is of primary concern.

"Members support the following principles in the belief that these objectives assist in defining the division and the possible differences between it and other divisions of the Association. This statement shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences. A member of Division II:

[22.10-(a) through 22.10-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Believes championships are intended to provide national-level competition among eligible student-athletes and teams of member institutions;"

[20.10-(d) through 20.10-(j) relettered to 22.10-(e) through 22.10-(k), unchanged.]

- E. Administrative:** Amend 31.02 by adding new 31.02.4, page 309, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"31.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

[31.02.1 through 31.02.3 unchanged.]

"31.02.4 Nullification. Nullification is a penalty imposed on an institution by the Championships Committee for permitting an ineligible student-athlete to compete in intercollegiate competition."

- F. Administrative:** Amend 31.1.1 by adding new 31.1.1.3, pages 309-310, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"31.1.1 Authority of Championships and Sports Committees. As specified in Bylaw 18.1, all NCAA championships shall be conducted in accordance with the general policies established by the Championships Committee and shall be under the control, direction and supervision of the appropriate sports committees, subject to the standards and conditions set forth in these executive regulations. Additional policies of an administrative nature are set forth in the respective championships handbooks and are to be followed in the administration of NCAA championships.

[31.1.1.1 through 31.1.1.2 unchanged.]

“31.1.1.3 Appeal of Nullification Decisions of Championships Committee. An appeal of a nullification will be considered by the Championships Committee, or a subcommittee designated by it, within 72 hours of a nullification decision. During such period, the Championships Committee, or a subcommittee designated by it, shall be the final authority acting on appeals concerning nullification decisions.”

G. Administrative: Amend 31.2.1, pages 314-315, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“31.2.1 Institutional Eligibility. To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in NCAA championships, an institution shall recognize the sport involved as a varsity intercollegiate sport (see Bylaw 17.02.13) and shall meet the institutional requirements set forth in Bylaw 18.4.2 applicable to the division in which the institution is a member or for which it is petitioning for eligibility in a sport. An institution that holds membership in a member conference may not enter teams or individuals in an NCAA championship unless they are eligible for such competition under the rules of that conference [see Bylaw 18.4.2.1-(a)], as well as any additional requirements specified in the applicable championships handbook.

[31.2.1.1 through 31.2.1.6 unchanged.]

“31.2.1.7 Eligibility Requirements. Institutional eligibility for all championships shall be limited to member institutions that meet institutional eligibility requirements (Bylaw 31.2.1) and any additional requirements specified in the applicable championships handbooks.

“31.2.1.7.1 Eligibility of Participants Notification of Ineligibility. An institution shall advise the NCAA championships staff if a student-athlete who has participated in regular-season competition becomes ineligible before the date on which the governing sports committee selects championship participants, as indicated in the appropriate championships handbook.

“31.2.1.7.1 Eligibility Verification Form. An institution that believes it is under consideration for NCAA championships selection shall administer, on a form prescribed by the Championships Committee, a statement which verifies that the institution does not know or have reason to know that the eligibility status of any student-athlete has changed since the institution last certified the student-athlete’s eligibility for competition. The form must be provided to the Division II Sports Committee liaison at a time established by the applicable sports committee. Further, a copy of the form shall be submitted to the institution’s conference office, if applicable.”

[31.2.1.7.1.2 through 31.2.1.7.1.3 unchanged.]

H. Administrative: Amend 31.2.2, page 315, as follows:
[Roll Call]

“31.2.2 Individual Student-Athlete Eligibility. To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in an NCAA championship, an institution shall recognize the sport involved as a varsity intercollegiate sport (see Constitution 3.2.4.4 and Bylaw 17.02.13) and shall meet the institutional requirements in Bylaw 18.4.2 applicable to the division in which the institution is a member or for which it is petitioning for eligibility in a sport, as well as any additional requirements specified in the applicable championships handbooks. All student-athletes, regardless of division, must meet the satisfy all general eligibility standards requirements established for NCAA championships competition participation. The general and academic eligibility requirements are set forth in detail in Bylaw 14, in which there is also reference to other legislation regarding eligibility of the individuals student-athlete. Other specific requirements for eligibility for NCAA championships (e.g., authority of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, amateur status certification and ineligibility for use of banned drugs) are set forth in Bylaws 18.4.1, 10.3 and 10.4. are included in other bylaws in this Manual and are applicable and binding for championships participation. The Executive committee may require student-athletes to certify their eligibility for championship competition.

“31.2.2.1 Eligibility Requirements. A member institution shall not enter a student-athlete, as an individual or as a member of a team, in an NCAA championship unless the student-athlete satisfies the relevant all eligibility requirements of Bylaw 14.

“31.2.2.2 Conference Eligibility. An institution that holds membership in a member conference may not enter teams or individuals in an NCAA championship unless they are eligible for such competition under the rules of that conference [see Bylaw 18.4.2.1-(a)].”

[31.2.2.2 through 31.2.2.5 renumbered as 31.2.2.3 through 31.2.2.6, unchanged.]

I. Administrative: Amend 31.3, page 319, as follows:
[Roll Call]

“31.3 Selection of Teams and Individuals for Championships Participation. A list of the institutions in good standing shall be supplied by the Association’s president championships staff liaison to the chair of each governing sports committee and to the athletics director of the host institution. This list should be observed carefully to assure that no entries are accepted from or invitations extended to ineligible institutions prior to selection of the championship participants in each Division II championship sport.

[31.3.1 through 31.3.2 unchanged]

“31.3.3 Criteria for Selection of Participants. The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition, and a governing sports committee that wishes to use additional criteria must obtain Championships Committee approval before doing so:

“(a) Won-lost record;

“(b) Strength of schedule;

“(c) *Eligibility and* **a**Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; **and**

“(d) Nullification.

[31.3.3.1 through 31.3.3.2 unchanged]

“31.3.3.3 Ineligible Unavailable Players on Team. The presence on a varsity squad of one or more players who are *ineligible, or unavailable due to injury*, for NCAA championships competition does not necessarily disqualify that team from consideration. *If such a player(s) contributed materially to the team’s success during the season, the committee may choose not to select that team, based on the conclusion that without the use of the ineligible or unavailable player(s), the team would not have been able to compile the record that brought it before the committee for consideration. It shall be the responsibility of the governing sports committee to apply the criterion “contributed materially” to each case as it arises.*”

J. Administrative: Amend 32.4 by adding new 32.4.3, page 338, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“32.4.3 Appeal of Secondary Cases. An institution may appeal penalties imposed by the enforcement staff for secondary violations by submitting a written notice of appeal to the Committee on Infractions. The committee must receive the appeal and any supporting documentation within 30 days of the date of the institution receives the enforcement staff’s decision. An institution may request the opportunity to appear in person or through participation in a telephone conference call. If no such request is made, or if the request is denied, the committee will review the institution’s appeal on the basis of the written record.”

Source: Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Eligibility Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: To ensure equitable and fair access to NCAA championships, the Championships Eligibility Project Team created a system that penalizes institutions that use ineligible student-athletes during inter-collegiate competition. The nullification system is used only in the selection process and is designed to penalize the team that competes with an ineligible student-athlete without adversely affecting opponents. All contests in which an ineligible student-athlete competes

will be nullified. A penalty will be assessed to the selection criteria (won/lost record and the strength of schedule), which may impact the individual and/or team's opportunity for selection to NCAA postseason competition. This system also eliminates the need for sports committees to evaluate the material contribution of an individual. Eliminating the evaluation of material contribution and to have a quantitative criteria to penalize a team for using an ineligible student-athletes is extremely helpful for sports committees during the evaluation process.

Action: Adopted, 253-1-1.

CONDUCT AND EMPLOYMENT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

NO. 24 (NO. 2-3) CONDUCT AND EMPLOYMENT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — LIMITATIONS ON COMPENSATION AND REMUNERATION — EMPLOYMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS

Intent: To specify that institutional staff members may be employed by a professional sports organization in accordance with institutional policies.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.3, page 60, as follows:

“11.3.3 Employment with Professional Sports Organizations. Institutional staff members may be employed by a professional sports organization in accordance with institutional policies.

“11.3.3.1 Nonpermissible Employment Arrangements. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities for representing a professional sports organization as a coach or scout in the negotiating of a contract or for the performance of other services that involve the observation of or contact with athletics talent, except during times in which the staff member is not under contract with the institution. Except as provided by in Bylaw 11.3.3.2, any compensational arrangement between a professional sports organization and a college staff member (e.g., for scouting other professional teams or assisting the professional employer in coaching its team) is evidence of an indirect arrangement to assure the staff member's assistance in evaluating or procuring college talent.

“11.3.3.1.1 Semiprofessional Organization. Employment arrangements with semiprofessional sports organizations or with professional or semiprofessional organizations involved in a sport in which the NCAA conducts a championship (or one in which the playing rules and skills are directly related to the NCAA sport; e.g., box lacrosse, indoor soccer or indoor football) are subject to the limitations in this section.

“11.3.3.2 Permissible Employment or Income Arrangements.

“11.3.3.2.1 Employment Unrelated to Restricted Activities. A staff member may be employed by a professional sports orga-

nization, if the institution documents that the individual is in no way directly or indirectly involved in the coaching, scouting or contacting of athletics talent or the negotiation of a contract for such talent (e.g., participation as a player on a professional team). “11.3.3.2.2 Established Professional Enhancement Program. A staff member may participate in an established, formal program administered by a professional sports organization and designed to enhance the skills associated with the staff member’s profession. A staff member participating in the program may receive direct compensation (including stipends) and expenses from the sponsoring organization, consistent with the compensation and expenses received by other program participants. The Management Council shall establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation by an institution’s staff members in such a program.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Currently, institutional staff members may not accept compensation or gratuities for representing a professional sports organization as a coach or a scout, except when a staff member is not under contract with the institution. This legislation will deregulate this area and provide institutional staff members increased access and job opportunities with professional sports organizations, provided the employment is in accordance with institutional policy.

Action: Adopted.

RECRUITING

*NO. 25 (NO. 2-7) RECRUITING — CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS — CONTACTABLE PROSPECTS — HIGH-SCHOOL PROSPECTS

Intent: To permit an institution to make one telephone call to a prospect in March of the prospect’s junior year in high school; one in-person, off-campus contact during April of the prospect’s junior year in high school; and all other telephone calls or in-person, off-campus contacts on or after June 15 following the completion of the prospect’s junior year in high school.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, page 80, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. *Telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or a prospect’s relatives or legal guardians before June 15 immediately preceding the prospect’s senior year in high school. One telephone call to a prospect or a prospect’s relatives or legal guardians may be made during March of the prospect’s junior year in high*

school. One in-person, off-campus recruiting contact with a prospect or a prospect's relatives or legal guardians on the prospect's high school campus may be made during April of the prospect's junior year in high school. Additional telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians before June 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school."

Source: Lone Star Conference, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Great Lakes Valley Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This proposal would simplify the recruiting process by creating consistency with Division I and Division II recruiting legislation and provide an earlier opportunity to contact and educate prospective student-athletes and parents regarding NCAA rules and regulations.

Committee Position: (NCAA Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee oppose this proposal. The Councils and committee noted this proposal is not student-athlete friendly because it will permit institutions to begin the recruiting process earlier in a prospect's high-school career when such prospects should be focusing on school and competing at the high-school level. The Councils and committee further noted that this proposal will cause disruption to prospects at a critical period of time during the academic year.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 26 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING — RECRUITING ADVERTISEMENTS — NONATHLETICS INSTITUTIONAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Intent: To permit an institution (or a third party acting on behalf of the institution) to publish nonathletics institutional advertisements in nonathletics, high-school publications and other nonathletics publications, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.4.1 by adding new 13.4.4.1.1, page 87, as follows:

"13.4.4.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publication of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member institution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted, **except as provided in Bylaw 13.4.4.1.1.** Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospects (e.g., recruiting publications) for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the in-

stitution. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

"13.4.4.1.1 Nonathletics Institutional Advertisements. An institution [or a third party acting on behalf of the institution] may publish nonathletics institutional advertisements in nonathletics, high-school publications (e.g., yearbooks, newspapers, music programs, prom programs) and other nonathletics publications provided:

"(a) The funds generated by the advertisements are not used for the high-school athletics program;

"(b) The institution's athletics department is not involved in the advertisements; and

"(c) The advertisements do not contain athletics information."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Recent budget reductions have forced most college marketing directors to seek creative solutions to the problem of contacting potential students and their parents in both an efficient and effective manner. Pursuant to the current legislation, institutions are prohibited from advertising in nonathletics, high-school publications and other nonathletically related publications. This proposal would permit institutions to solicit potential students through nonathletics messages in nonathletics, high-school publications such as yearbooks, newspapers, prom programs and other nonathletics publications reviewed by a large number of prospective students and their parents.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 27 (NO. 2-12) RECRUITING — TRANSPORTATION ON OFFICIAL VISIT — FROM AIRPORT

Intent: To permit any member of an institution's athletics department staff to provide ground transportation during an official visit for a prospect and any prospect's parents or legal guardians between the campus and any bus, train station or airport.

Bylaws: Amend 13.5.2.4, page 89, as follows:

"13.5.2.4 From Airport. During the official visit, any member of an institution's athletics department staff may provide **ground transportation for a prospect between the campus and *the* any bus or train station or *major* airport *nearest the campus*. **The 48-hour period begins at the time the prospect arrives on the institution's campus. The transportation must be without delay for personal reasons or entertainment purposes.**"**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: There are institutions that are located in rural areas and the flight selections are limited. Allowing institutions to choose any airport from campus will provide institutions flexibility with available flight times and prices. For some institutions, it could provide savings that equal thousands of dollars per year. It could also make travel easier for the prospect with respect to layovers and a greater likelihood of booking direct flights.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 28 (NO. 2-14) RECRUITING — PUBLICITY — ANNOUNCEMENT OF SIGNING

Intent: To specify that after a prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or offer of admission and/or financial aid, an institution may release information related to the signing to any media outlet; further to specify that there are no limits on the number of occasions that the information may be released and the institution is not allowed to purchase or receive commercial advertising (e.g., print, media, billboard) that identifies the prospective student-athlete by name or picture.

Bylaws: Amend 13.10.7, page 97, as follows:

*“13.10.7 Announcement of Media Release Regarding Signing. Publicity released by an institution concerning a prospect’s commitment to attend the institution shall occur only after the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or after the prospect’s signed acceptance of the institution’s written offer of admission and/or financial aid. Such communications shall **may** be limited to those media forms normally used by the institution released to media outlets at the institution’s discretion except as limited by Bylaw 13.10.7.1. There are no limitations on the number of occasions that an institution may release such information. However, an institution is prohibited from purchasing or receiving commercial advertising (e.g., print, media, billboard) to be used to identify a prospect by name or picture. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect’s eligibility; however, such violations shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1.*

“13.10.7.1 Media Outlets. Such communications shall be released only to those media outlets normally used by the institution and by the educational institutions currently and formerly attended by the prospect.”

[13.10.7.2 through 13.10.7.5 renumbered as 13.10.7.1 through 13.10.7.4, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: This proposal would permit institutions to increase the use of technology to release information on signees and minimize unnecessary administrative scrutiny. Current restrictions related to press conferences and the prohibition related to personal contact with the media at the site of the signing remain applicable.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 29 (NO. 2-15) RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — LOCAL SPORTS CLUBS

Intent: In sports other than basketball, to permit an institution's coach to be involved as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 100-mile radius of the institution).

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2.4, page 99, as follows:

"13.11.2.4 Local Sports Clubs. In sports other than basketball, an institution's coach may be involved as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 50 **100**-mile radius of the institution). Further, in club teams involving multiple teams or multiple sports, the 50 **100**-mile radius is applicable only to the team with which the institution's coach is involved; however, it is not permissible for the coach to assign a prospect who lives outside the 50 **100**-mile area to another coach of the club. A coach may be involved with a local sports club located in the institution's home community that includes prospects participating in a sport other than the coach's sport, regardless of where such prospects reside. A coach also may be involved in activities with individuals who are not of prospect age (i.e., before the ninth grade), regardless of where such individuals reside."

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association and Great Northwest Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: Expanding the radius to 100 miles increases the number of prospects who can participate in local sports clubs, and therefore allows for more involvement from institutions' coaches. The legislation regarding local sports clubs was initiated over 15 years ago and the 50-mile radius was determined to constitute the "local" area. Today, it is not uncommon for individuals to live, work and attend academic institutions outside of a 50-mile radius. Under the current legislation, if a single prospect who participates on the local sports club team lives more than 50 miles from the institution, the institution's coach may not coach that club team. For example, a part-time coach could live 30 miles south of his institution's campus and coach a local sports club team five miles south of

his home. If any prospects on that team live 16 miles south or more from the club, then the coach is not permitted to be involved with the team. Changing the legislation from a 50-mile radius to a 100-mile radius of the institution is more realistic, and the bylaw still contains the protection that the prospects must be legal residents of the area. It is proposed that this goes into effect immediately because a high number of local sports clubs occur in the summer, and this change would allow coaches to participate in local sports clubs during the summer of 2006.

Committee Position: (NCAA Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal. The Councils and committee noted that this proposal is consistent with its deregulation efforts. In addition, the Councils and committee noted that the Management Council Administrative Review Subcommittee frequently approves waiver requests regarding the mileage limitation in the local sports clubs legislation.

Action: Adopted.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 30 (NO. 2-20) ELIGIBILITY — CHANGE IN ELIGIBILITY STATUS — EXCEPTION

Intent: To establish an exception to the certification of the six-hour term-by-term requirement for those institutions whose submissions or posting date of grades is within three days of the first day of classes of the following term; further, to require institutions that use this exception to provide to the NCAA national office the number of student-athletes who are ultimately declared ineligible for the academic term but competed during the exception period.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.10 by adding new 14.1.10.1, page 114, as follows:

“14.1.10 Change in Eligibility Status. If a student-athlete’s academic eligibility changes at the end of a quarter or semester, the student-athlete shall become eligible or ineligible to compete on the date his or her eligibility is officially certified by the appropriate institutional authority. In a case in which the student becomes eligible at the end of the term, the earliest date on which the student can become eligible to compete is the day after the date of the last scheduled examination listed in the institution’s official calendar for the term that is ending. In a case in which the student becomes ineligible, the ineligibility shall become effective not later than the first day of classes of the following semester or quarter. In any case, if the student-athlete is academically eligible to compete at the time of the student-athlete’s or the institution’s first participation in an NCAA championship, he or she shall remain eligible for the remainder of the championship.

“14.1.10.1 Exception.

“14.1.10.1.1 Institutions with Official Posting Date for

Grades. An institution whose official posting date for grades falls within three days of the first day of classes for the following academic term shall have three business days from the official date on which grades must be posted to certify that student-athletes have satisfactorily completed at least six-semester or six-quarter hours of academic credit the preceding regular academic term (see Bylaw 14.4.3.1). For those institutions that post grades on a rolling basis, the three-business day period shall begin within the first week of classes.

“14.1.10.1.2 Institutions with no Official Posting Date for Grades. An institution whose official submission date for grades falls on or after the first day of classes for the following academic term shall have five business days from the date on which grades are submitted to certify that student-athletes have satisfactorily completed at least six-semester or six-quarter hours of academic credit the preceding regular academic term (see Bylaw 14.4.3.1).

“14.1.10.1.3 Certification of Eligibility. During the three-business day or five-business day period, a student-athlete who is otherwise eligible under NCAA, conference and institutional requirements, shall be permitted to compete. If during the exception period, a student-athlete is certified ineligible, the student-athlete shall be declared immediately ineligible for competition. If the three-business day or five-business day period concludes prior to the certification of eligibility for any student-athlete, the student-athlete(s) shall be ineligible until such time the student-athlete(s) is declared eligible for competition.

“14.1.10.1.4 Notification to NCAA national office. As a condition of the exception, an institution shall provide to the NCAA national office, the number of student-athlete(s) who are ultimately declared ineligible for the academic term but competed during the exception period.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: There are institutions whose grades for the previous academic term are posted or submitted on or after the first day of classes of the following regular academic term. The exception provides an institution up to three business days from the date on which the grades are officially posted, or five business days from the date the grades are submitted (if no official posting date exists) to certify the eligibility of its student-athletes in accordance with the six-hour requirement. If the three-day or five-day period expires prior to certification of a student-athlete, the student-athlete would be declared ineligible until such time as the certi-

fication occurs. Further, institutions are required to report situations to the NCAA national office the number of times a student-athlete receives an extension of eligibility into the new term, but ultimately is declared ineligible.

Action: Adopted.

FINANCIAL AID

NO. 31 (NO. 2-26) FINANCIAL AID — TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AWARDING INSTITUTIONAL FINANCIAL AID — PERIOD OF AWARD — ONE-YEAR LIMIT

Intent: To permit athletics awards to be written for the academic year and the following summer at the institution's discretion.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.6, page 146, as follows:

“15.02.6 Period of Award. The period of award begins when the student-athlete receives any benefits as part of the student-athlete's grant-in-aid on the first day of classes for a particular academic term, or the first day of practice, whichever is earlier, until the conclusion of the period set forth in the financial aid agreement. An athletics grant-in-aid shall not be awarded in excess of one academic year **and the following summer.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.3.3, page 152, as follows:

“15.3.3 Period of Institutional Financial Aid Award.

“15.3.3.1 One-Year Limit. Where a student's athletics ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding financial aid, such aid shall not be awarded in excess of one academic year **and the following summer.**

[15.3.3.1.1 through 15.3.3.2 unchanged.]

“15.3.3.2.1 Summer Term as Additional Award. It is necessary to make an additional award for a summer term, inasmuch as a member institution is limited to the award of financial aid for a period of not in excess of one academic year.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This permissive legislation will permit a student-athlete to better plan his or her academic calendar, including the summer term. In addition, this proposal will provide a student-athlete notice to determine whether funds will be available for summer school. For those institutions that award athletically related summer aid, the policies and rules related to the award should be set by the institution and should be monitored by the financial aid office consistent with the monitoring of other institutional aid provided to the general student body for the summer term(s).

Action: Defeated, 113-141-5.

***NO. 32 (NO. 2-28) FINANCIAL AID — EQUIVALENCY
SPORTS — EQUIVALENCY
COMPUTATIONS**

Intent: To clarify that an institution may use either the actual or average amount received by a student-athlete as the numerator and either the actual or average amount of the full grant-in-aid value in the denominator for equivalency purposes.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.2.2, pages 155-156, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“15.5.2.2 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

[15.5.2.2-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) A fraction shall be created, with the amount received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the full grant-in-aid value for that student-athlete as the denominator based upon the actual cost or average cost of a full grant for all students at that institution. **In addition, an institution may use either the actual or average amount received by a student-athlete as the numerator and either the actual or average amount of the full grant-in-aid value as the denominator.**”

[15.5.2.2-(c) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council.

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: This proposal continues the spirit of deregulation by permitting an institution to use either the actual or average amount received by a student-athlete as the numerator and either the actual or average amount of the full grant-in-aid value in the denominator for equivalency purposes. Permitting the actual amount received by the student-athlete in the numerator and the average full grant-in-aid in the denominator will simplify the equivalency calculation by creating one number to be used in the denominator for all student-athletes no matter the actual full grant-in-aid amount.

Action: Adopted, 232-2-1.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS

**NO. 33 (NO. 2-30) AWARDS AND BENEFITS — EXPENSES
PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR
PRACTICE AND COMPETITION —
TRAVEL APPAREL**

Intent: To permit an institution to provide student-athletes with team travel outfits, blazers or other items of clothing to travel to and from competition.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1 by adding new 16.8.1.9, page 169, as follows:
 “16.8.1 Permissible. The permissible expenses for practice and competition that an institution may provide a student-athlete are defined in the following subsections (See Bylaw 16.11).
 [16.8.1.1 through 16.8.1.8 unchanged.]
“16.8.1.9 Travel Apparel. An institution may provide student-athletes with team travel outfits, blazers or other items of clothing to travel to and from competition.”
- B. Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.2, page 169, as follows:
 “16.8.2 Nonpermissible
“16.8.2.1 Travel Apparel. An institution may not provide student-athletes team travel outfits, blazers or other items of clothing that are not sports-related practice or competition apparel.”
 [16.8.2.2 through 16.8.2.4 renumbered as 16.8.2.1 through 16.8.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This legislative proposal is permissive and continues the Division II trend of deregulation. Institutions should have the discretion to provide clothing to student-athletes to travel to and from competition. The committee recognizes that while student-athletes are traveling they are still representing the institution and should be permitted to wear institutionally provided clothing.

Action: Adopted.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

*NO. 34 (NO. 2-31) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS — SKILL INSTRUCTION

Intent: In sports other than football, to permit student-athletes and members of the coaching staff to engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's playing season, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2.1, page 181, as follows:
 [Roll Call]

“17.1.5.2.1 Individual and Team Skill Instruction. In sports other than football, *participation by student-athletes in individual skill-related instruction is permitted outside the institution's declared playing season, provided no more than four student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coach(es) at any one time in any facility.* **and members of the coaching staff may engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's playing season as follows:**

- “(a) A student-athlete is permitted to engage in a maximum of eight hours of countable athletically related activities per week outside the playing season, during the academic year;
- “(b) No more than two of the eight hours of countable athletically related activities may be devoted to individual or team skill-related instruction;
- “(c) There are no limitations on the number of student-athletes who may be involved in individual or team skill-related instruction activities; and
- “(d) All countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of each student-athlete’s final exams.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal gives coaches flexibility to include more than four student-athletes in individual skill instruction in response to concerns about the inconvenience of limiting the number of student-athletes who are able to participate at any one time. This flexibility will more effectively use student-athletes’ and coaches’ time. Further, the prohibition against activities during the week before final exams will ensure that time is available for study.

Action: Defeated, 103-152-3.

NO. 35 (NO. 2-33) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — SUMMER PRACTICE — FACILITY FEES

Intent: To permit an institution to pay fees associated with the use of the institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport during the summer.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.6.1, page 188, as follows:

“17.2.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.2.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.6.1, page 190, as follows:

“17.3.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.3.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.8.1, page 191, as follows:

“17.4.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.6.6.1, page 196, as follows:

“17.6.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.6.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.8.1, page 198, as follows:

“17.7.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.7.8.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- F. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.6.1, page 200, as follows:

“17.8.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

- G. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.9.6.1, page 202, as follows:

“17.9.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.9.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- H. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.8.1, page 204, as follows:

“17.10.8.1 Summer Practice. Field hockey practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

- I. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.12.8.1, page 209, as follows:

“17.12.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.12.8.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

J. Bylaws: Amend 17.13.6.1, page 212, as follows:

“17.13.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.13.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

K. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.6.1, page 215, as follows:

“17.14.6.1 Summer Practice. Ice hockey practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

L. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.8.1, page 216, as follows:

“17.15.8.1 Summer Practice. Lacrosse practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

M. Bylaws: Amend 17.16.6.1, page 219, as follows:

“17.16.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.16.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

N. Bylaws: Amend 17.17.8.1, page 221, as follows:

“17.17.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.17.8.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

O. Bylaws: Amend 17.18.6.1, page 223, as follows:

“17.18.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaw (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

P. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.6.1, page 225, as follows:

“17.19.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.19.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

- Q. Bylaws:** Amend 17.20.8.1, page 227, as follows:
- “17.20.8.1 Summer Practice. Soccer practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”
- R. Bylaws:** Amend 17.21.8.1, page 229, as follows:
- “17.21.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”
- S. Bylaws:** Amend 17.22.6.1, page 231, as follows:
- “17.22.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**
- “17.22.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”
- T. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23.6.1, page 233, as follows:
- “17.23.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**
- “17.23.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

U. Bylaws: Amend 17.24.6.1, page 235, as follows:

“17.24.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

V. Bylaws: Amend 17.25.6.1, page 237, as follows:

“17.25.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

W. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.8.1, page 240, as follows:

“17.26.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.26.8.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

X. Bylaws: Amend 17.27.6.1, page 242, as follows:

“17.27.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.27.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

Y. Bylaws: Amend 17.28.1.6.1, page 244, as follows:

“17.28.1.6.1 Summer Practice - Men. Volleyball practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

Z. Bylaws: Amend 17.29.6.1, page 249, as follows:

“17.29.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**”

AA. Bylaws: Amend 17.30.6.1, page 251, as follows:

“17.30.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. **An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.**

“17.30.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach’s team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. *It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility.*”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal permits an institution to pay fees for the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes for voluntary activities in their sport during the summer. Currently, it is permissible for an institution to pay fees required to reserve a facility outside the playing and practice season (e.g., golf course, skating rink) during the academic year and to pay fees required to reserve a facility during institutional vacation periods during the academic year and for those vacation periods that fall outside the playing and practice season. The only time an institution may not pay fees is during the summer. Therefore, institutions charge student-athletes the going rate to use institutional facilities for voluntary activities unless

the facility is open/available to the general public for no charge. Opening the facility to the general public creates liability concerns and requires additional monitoring. In facilities that normally charge for usage (e.g., tennis, golf, ice rink), the cost to use the facility often is prohibitive for student-athletes. This proposal permits institutions to allow student-athletes to voluntarily use practice or competition facilities at a reduced rate (or free) during the summer, just as they can during the rest of the calendar year.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 36 (NO. 2-34) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION — FALL SPORTS

Intent: In cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball, to specify that an institution shall not engage in its first date of competition before the Thursday preceding August 30.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.3, page 196, as follows:

"17.7.3 First Date of Competition - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding *September 1 August 30.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.3, page 203, as follows:

"17.10.3 First Contest - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding *September 1 August 30.*"

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.3, page 206, as follows:

"17.11.3 First Contest - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding *September 1 August 30.*"

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.20.3, page 226, as follows:

"17.20.3 First Date of Competition - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding *September 1 August 30.*"

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.28.2.3, page 245, as follows:

"17.28.2.3 First Date of Competition - Championship Segment — Women. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding *September 1 August 30.*"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: During the 2003 NCAA Convention, the Division II membership adopted Proposal No. 37, specifying that an institution could not engage in its first date of competition before the Thursday preceding September 1 in cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball. The change did not allow for 13 consistent weeks of competition prior to the Thanksgiving weekend each year. Rather, the change resulted in a loss of one week in the fall playing and practice season two of every seven years. The recommended change will provide for 13 consistent weeks for the championship segment for fall sports.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 37 (NO. 2-35) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
FOOTBALL FIVE-DAY ACCLIMATIZATION
PERIOD — WALK-THROUGHS**

Intent: In football, to permit an institution to conduct one one-hour walk-through per day during the five-day acclimatization period, provided protective equipment (e.g., helmets, shoulder pads) is not worn, equipment related to football (e.g., footballs, blocking sleds) is not used and conditioning activities do not occur.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2.3, page 205, as follows:

[Football Only]

“17.11.2.3 Five-Day Acclimatization Period. Preseason practice shall begin with a five-day acclimatization period for both first-time participants (e.g., freshmen and transfers) and continuing student-athletes. All student-athletes, including walk-ons who arrive to preseason practice after the first day of practice, are required to undergo a five-day acclimatization period. The five-day acclimatization period shall be conducted as follows:

[17.11.2.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Participants shall not engage in more than one on-field practice per day during the five-day acclimatization period. On-field practices shall last no longer than three hours.

“(1) **Exception — During the five-day acclimatization period, an institution has the option of conducting one on-field practice per day, not to exceed three hours in length, or one on-field testing session (speed, conditioning, or agility tests) per day, not to exceed one hour in length and one on-field practice, not to exceed two hours in length. In addition, an institution may conduct one one-hour walk-through session per day of the acclimatization period, provided protective equipment (e.g., helmets, shoulder pads) is not worn, equipment related to football (e.g., footballs, blocking sleds) is not used and conditioning activities do not occur. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time be-**

tween the end of the first session (i.e., testing, practice or walk-through) and the start of the final session (i.e., testing, practice or walk-through) occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically-related activities (e.g., weight lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2.4.1, page 206, as follows:

[Football Only]

“17.11.2.4.1 Exception - “Walk-Through.” During the preseason practice period *only and subsequent to the five-day acclimatization period*, on-field walk-throughs are not considered an on-field activity under Bylaw 17.11.2.4, provided protective equipment (e.g., helmets, shoulder pads) is not worn, equipment related to football (e.g., footballs, blocking sleds) is not used and conditioning activities do not occur. The walk-through shall not last longer than one hour and may only be conducted on days in which one practice is permitted. Further, student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between the on-field practice and the walk-through. During this recovery time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities, including weightlifting; however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: After experiencing the first couple of years of preseason football practice under the new out-of-season conditioning model, teams should be able to engage in on-field “walk-throughs” that provide for critical teaching/learning opportunities without compromising the health and well-being of student-athletes during the five-day acclimatization period. Further, the proposed time limitations will help prevent encroachment on academic orientation activities.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 38 (NO. 2-36) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — GOLF — PRACTICE AND COMPETITION DATES

Intent: In golf, tournaments count multi-day golf tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates during the nonchampionship segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5.1, page 208, as follows:

“17.12.5.1 Exception — Alternate Playing Season. A member institution that declares fall as its institution’s championship seg-

ment per Constitution 3.2.4.12.1, may use the playing season dates for sports that conduct a fall championship. **Multi-day tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) may count as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates, regardless of the number of days of the tournament.** Further, an institution that uses this exception and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment. The institution is eligible for the NCAA championship.”

[Remainder of 17.12.5.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.8, pages 209, as follows:

“17.12.8 Out-of-Season and Nonchampionship Segment Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the championship segment except for the following:

[17.12.8-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which the NCAA championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced or on days that the institution is closed due to inclement weather, as long as no practice or competition occurs on such days. **Multi-day tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) may count as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates, regardless of the number of days of the tournament.** The 45 consecutive calendar days must be within the dates set forth in Bylaws 17.12.5 and 17.12.6.”

[17.12.8-(b)-(1) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Current golf playing-season regulations pertaining to the nonchampionship segment permit institutions to participate in any practice or competition provided the activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45-consecutive calendar days. During the 24/45-day calendar period, most institutions do not qualify for competition, allow freshman student-athletes to compete or conduct team practices prior to competition. Accordingly, the 24/45-day calendar inhibits preparation for competition. This proposal seeks to rectify this scenario by allowing institutions to count multi-day golf tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) as one of the 24 practice or

competition dates. As a result, the proposal benefits student-athletes and is consistent with deregulation efforts.

Action: Adopted.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

NO. 39 (NO. 2-39) ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS — CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Intent: To require all athletics department staff members, except for students or student-athletes responsible only for the completion of clerical duties, to sign the certification of compliance form.

Administrative: Amend 30.3, page 302, as follows:

“30.3 CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE. A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA championship unless its chief executive officer makes an annual institutional eligibility certification [see Bylaw 18.4.2.1-(d)] attesting that the conditions specified below have been satisfied. The certification shall be completed not later than September 15.

[30.3.1 through 30.3.4 unchanged.]

“30.3.5 Report of the NCAA Violation Involving Institution. A current statement has been filed with the chief executive officer, as part of the institution’s annual certification, which is signed by each athletics department staff member (except for *clerical personnel* **students or student-athletes responsible only for the completion of clerical duties**) attesting that the individual has reported any knowledge of an involvement in any violations of NCAA legislation involving the institution.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Rationale: The certification of compliance form is intended to certify that an athletics department staff member has reported all known violations of NCAA legislation involving the institution; however, current legislation does not require clerical personnel to sign the form. Clerical personnel are as knowledgeable as other athletics department staff members regarding the interaction between athletics department staff members and student-athletes or prospective student-athletes and, thus, should be required to sign the form. However, students or student-athletes employed by an athletics department who are responsible only for the completion of clerical duties should be excluded from signing the Certification of Compliance Form because most of these individuals are not knowledgeable about the day-to-day operations of the athletics department or the interactions between athletics department staff members and student-athletes or prospective student-athletes.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 40 (NO. 2-40) ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS — 10-SEMESTER/ 15-QUARTER RULE WAIVER — STUDENT-ATHLETE NOT USING A SEASON OF COMPETITION DURING INITIAL YEAR OF COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who does not compete during his or her first season of competition and, due to circumstances beyond his or her control, is not able to complete four seasons of competition prior to the expiration of intercollegiate eligibility, to receive an eligibility extension.

A. Administrative: Amend 30.6.1.2, pages 304-305, as follows:

“30.6.1.2 Circumstances Within Control. Circumstances that are considered to be within the control of the student-athlete and the institution and cause a participation opportunity to be used include, but are not limited to, the following:

[30.6.1.2-(a) through 30.6.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) Redshirt year, **unless it meets the exception pursuant to Bylaw 30.6.1.3;**

[30.6.1.2-(e) through 30.6.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

B. Administrative: Amend 30.6.1, by adding new 30.6.1.3, page 305, as follows:

“**30.6.1.3 Exception — Student-Athlete Who Does Not Use Season of Competition During Initial Year of Collegiate Enrollment.** For a student-athlete who does not use a season of competition during his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment (e.g., redshirt year), a waiver may be granted if all of the following conditions are met:

“(a) The student-athlete was a qualifier;

“(b) The student-athlete did not compete during his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment (e.g., red-shirt);

“(c) The student-athlete was denied one participation opportunity per Bylaw 30.6.1 following his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment; and

“(d) The institution has filed the waiver prior to the beginning of student-athlete’s 11th semester or 16th quarter of full-time enrollment.

“**30.6.1.3.1 Application of Waiver.** If the waiver is granted, it must be used during the next available opportunity [e.g., next semester(s) or quarter(s)] and shall be applied at the institution where the student-athlete exhausted his or her tenth semester or fifteenth quarter of full-time enrollment.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Under the current extension-waiver legislation, when a student-athlete redshirts the first season and then, due to circumstances beyond his or her control, is only able to complete three of the four seasons of competition prior to the expiration of the 10-semester/15-quarter eligibility period, there is no provision for a one-year extension to complete the fourth season of competition. The proposed exception considers that in the vast majority of initial-year redshirt decisions, the involved student-athlete has little input. Therefore, when a subsequent circumstance beyond the student-athlete's control adversely impacts that student-athlete's ability to participate, he or she is denied a participation opportunity that, in any instances, cannot be made up (under the current waiver legislation) due to the initial-year redshirt decision - a decision about which the student-athlete may have had little if any input. This exception furthers student-athlete welfare and will reward student-athletes who achieve academically.

Action: Adopted.



Division II

Institution	Football 1=yes 2=no	Test Vote 1	*Football Only Schools test	Press NO on your pad	Prop# 17 (no. 2-1)	Prop# 18 (no. 2-2)	Prop# 19 (no. 2-4)	Prop# 22 (no. 2-23)	Prop# 23 (no. 2-24)	Prop# 31 (no. 2-26)	Prop#32 (no. 2-28)	Prop#34 (no. 2-30)
Abilene Christian University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Adams State College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Adelphi University	2											
Albany State University (Georgia)	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Alderson-Broaddus College	2											
American International College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Anderson College (South Carolina)	2											
Angelo State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Arkansas Tech University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Armstrong Atlantic State University	2											
Ashland University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Assumption College	1											
Augusta State University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Augustana College (South Dakota)	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Barry University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Barton College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Bellarmino University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Belmont Abbey College	2											
Bemidji State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Benedict College	1				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Bentley College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bloomfield College	2	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Bluefield State College	2			N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Bowie State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Brigham Young University- Hawaii	2											
Bryant University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
C_W_ Post Campus/Long Island University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Caldwell College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
California Collegiate Athletic Association	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
California State Polytechnic University- Pomona	2	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
California State University- Bakersfield	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University- Chico	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
California State University- Dominguez Hills	2	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
California State University- Los Angeles	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
California State University- San Bernardino	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University- Stanislaus	2	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Cameron University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N
Carolinas-Virginia Athletics Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y



Division II

	Football 1=yes 2=no	Test Vote 1	*Football Only Schools test	Press NO on your pad	Prop# 17 (no. 2-1)	Prop# 18 (no. 2-2)	Prop# 19 (no. 2-4)	Prop# 22 (no. 2-23)	Prop# 23 (no. 2-24)	Prop# 31 (no. 2-26)	Prop#32 (no. 2-28)	Prop#34 (no. 2-30)
Carson-Newman College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Catawba College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N
Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Central Missouri State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Washington University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Chadron State College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Chaminade University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Christian Brothers University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Clark Atlanta University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Clayton State University	2											
Coker College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
College of Saint Rose	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Colorado Christian University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Colorado School of Mines	1	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Colorado State University-Pueblo	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Columbia Union College	2											
Columbus State University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Concord University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Concordia College (New York)	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Concordia University- St_ Paul	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Converse College	2											
Dallas Baptist University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Davis and Elkins College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Delta State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Dominican College (New York)	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dowling College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Drury University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
East Central University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Eastern New Mexico University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Eckerd College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Elizabeth City State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Emporia State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Erskine College	2											
Fairmont State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Fayetteville State University	1	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N



Division II

	Football 1=yes 2=no	Test Vote 1	*Football Only Schools test	Press NO on your pad	Prop# 17 (no. 2-1)	Prop# 18 (no. 2-2)	Prop# 19 (no. 2-4)	Prop# 22 (no. 2-23)	Prop# 23 (no. 2-24)	Prop# 31 (no. 2-26)	Prop#32 (no. 2-28)	Prop#34 (no. 2-30)
Felician College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ferris State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Florida Gulf Coast University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida Institute of Technology	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Florida Southern College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Fort Hays State University	1	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N
Fort Lewis College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A
Fort Valley State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Francis Marion University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
Franklin Pierce College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gannon University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Georgia College & State University	2	Y		N				Y	Y	N	N	N
Georgian Court University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Glenville State College	1											
Goldey-Beacom College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grand Canyon University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grand Valley State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Great Lakes Valley Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Great Northwest Athletic Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	N
Green Mountain College	2											
Gulf South Conference	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Harding University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Hawaii Pacific University	2											
Heartland Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Henderson State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Hillsdale College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Holy Family University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N
Humboldt State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Johnson C_ Smith University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Kennesaw State University	2											
Kentucky State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Kentucky Wesleyan College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Lake Superior State University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Lander University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Lane College	1											
Le Moyne College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Lees-McRae College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N



Division II

[illegible]



Division II

[illegible]



Division II

	Football 1=yes 2=no	Test Vote 1	*Football Only Schools test	Press NO on your pad	Prop# 17 (no. 2-1)	Prop# 18 (no. 2-2)	Prop# 19 (no. 2-4)	Prop# 22 (no. 2-23)	Prop# 23 (no. 2-24)	Prop# 31 (no. 2-26)	Prop#32 (no. 2-28)	Prop#34 (no. 2-30)
Shaw University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Shepherd University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Sonoma State University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Atlantic Conference	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
South Dakota State University	1											
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	1	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y
Southern Arkansas University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Southern Connecticut State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Southern Illinois University- Edwardsville	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Intercol_ Ath_ Conf_	1		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Southern New Hampshire University	2	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
Southwest Baptist University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Southwest Minnesota State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A
St_ Andrews Presbyterian College	2											
St_ Augustine's College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
St_ Cloud State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
St_ Edward's University	2											
St_ Martin's University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
St_ Mary's University (Texas)	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St_ Paul's College	1	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
St_ Thomas Aquinas College	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Stillman College	1		N	N		Y	Y					N
Stonehill College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Sunshine State Conference	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Tarleton State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M University-Commerce	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Woman's University	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Tiffin University	1											
Truman State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Tusculum College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Tuskegee University	1					Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
University of Alabama- Huntsville	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
University of Alaska Anchorage	2	Y			Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Alaska Fairbanks	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
University of Arkansas- Monticello	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
University of Bridgeport	2	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y



Division II

[illegible]



	Football 1=yes 2=no	Test Vote 1	*Football Only Schools test	Press NO on your pad	Prop# 17 (no. 2-1)	Prop# 18 (no. 2-2)	Prop# 19 (no. 2-4)	Prop# 22 (no. 2-23)	Prop# 23 (no. 2-24)	Prop# 31 (no. 2-26)	Prop#32 (no. 2-28)	Prop#34 (no. 2-30)
University of Wisconsin- Parkside	2	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Upper Iowa University	1		N		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Valdosta State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N
Virginia State University	1	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Virginia Union University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Washburn University of Topeka	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne State College (Nebraska)	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne State University (Michigan)	1	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
West Liberty State College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Texas A&M University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
West Virginia University Institute of Technology	1											
West Virginia Wesleyan College	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Western New Mexico University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Oregon University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Western State College of Colorado	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Western Washington University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wheeling Jesuit University	2				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilmington College (Delaware)	2											
Wingate University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Winona State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Winston-Salem State University	1	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
YES	166	248	0	0	247	257	245	247	253	113	232	103
NO	138	1	148	248	4	0	9	10	1	141	21	152
ABSTAIN	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3
TOTAL VOTES	304	249	148	248	252	257	254	258	255	259	255	258

100th Annual Convention

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2005-06 NCAA Division III Manual.]

Topical Groupings of Proposed Amendments 100th Annual Convention

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 20	Presidents Council Grouping
21 through 29	General

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date before the first day of August, the proposal rationale statement shall contain reasons for the alternate effective date.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 1 (NO. 2-6) AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Intent: To revise the restrictions related to the use of a student-athlete's name or image in institutional, charitable, educational or nonprofit promotional activities, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1, page 58, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"12.5.1 Permissible. Student-athletes may participate in promotional activities as provided in this bylaw. Any promotional activity not listed is specifically prohibited.

"12.5.1.1 Institutional, Charitable, Educational or Nonprofit Promotions. A member institution or recognized entity thereof (e.g., fraternity, sorority or student government organization), a member conference or a noninstitutional charitable, educational or nonprofit agency may use a student-athlete's name, picture or appearance to support its charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics, provided the following conditions are met:

"(a) The student-athlete receives written approval to participate from the *director of athletics* **institution's chancellor or president (or designee)**, subject to the limitations on participants in such activities as set forth in Bylaw 17;

"(b) The specific activity or project in which the student-athlete participates does not involve cosponsorship, advertisement or promotion by a commercial agency *other than through the reproduction of the sponsoring company's officially registered regular trademark or logo on printed materials such as pictures, posters or calendars. The company's emblem, name, address and telephone number may be included with the trademark or logo. Personal names, messages and slogans (other than an officially registered trademark) are prohibited; , except as follows:*

"(1) **Identification (e.g., graphics, voice over, on-screen text) of the commercial entity must explain the commercial entity's affiliation with the permissible entity (e.g., entity is the official sponsor of the institution/event);**

"(2) **The appearance or description of the commercial product(s)/service(s) and/or the commercial entity's logo(s) may be included but may not exceed 25 percent of the total promo-**

tional activity. Further, language or action included in the promotion may not directly encourage the use or purchase of the commercial product or service (e.g., drink this product) with which the commercial entity is associated;

“(3) The promotion shall not feature alcoholic beverages, tobacco products or performance enhancing drugs. Further, the commercial entity shall not be any organization that promotes gambling.”

[Remainder of 12.5.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Management Council (Endorsements/Promotions Task Force).

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: While technology developments have increased the opportunities for multimedia promotions, current legislation has limited the potential to partner with commercial entities to advance educational initiatives such as the value of the student-athlete experience. This proposal would increase the flexibility to engage in various types of promotions while maintaining the current restrictions on the types of entities (i.e., institutional, charitable, educational, nonprofit) that may use the name or likeness of a student-athlete. The requirement to have the institution’s chancellor or president approve these promotional activities is not intended to have the chancellor or president approve every promotional activity. However, the expectation is that the chancellor or president will oversee the activities to ensure that the institution’s obligation to protect the student-athlete from exploitation in relationships with corporate entities is met. To help ensure that these promotions portray student-athletes in a positive manner, this proposal excludes the appearance of Division III student-athletes in promotions related to alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, performance enhancing drugs and gambling. It should be noted that both the requirement to identify the relationship between the commercial and permissible entities and the 25 percent limitation serves to maintain the focus of the promotion on the institution, charity, or educational or nonprofit organization. Finally, the principle of amateurism is sustained through precluding any encouragement of the purchase or use of the product and the prohibition on any direct endorsement of a student-athlete.

Action: Adopted, 400-6-0.

***NO. 2 (NO. 2-9) RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — EXCEPTION**

Intent: To permit institutional coaches to teach private lessons to a prospect, provided specified criteria are satisfied.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.3 by adding new 13.11.7, page 79, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“13.11.3 Tryout Exceptions.

[13.11.3.1 through 13.11.3.6 unchanged.]

“13.11.3.7 Private Lessons. An institution’s coach may teach private lessons to a prospect, provided the following criteria are satisfied:

“(a) The coach makes lessons available to the general public;

“(b) Fees charged to the prospect are at a rate commensurate with fees charged to all individuals;

“(c) Prior written approval is provided annually by the institution’s athletics director and the institution’s athletics department keeps on file documentation of the fee charged for the private lessons; and

“(d) Fees of the prospect are not paid by individuals or entities other than the prospect’s parents or guardian(s).”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Many Division III coaches rely on sources of income beyond their coaching salaries. Allowing these individuals to teach private lessons will benefit the coach as well as the community served by these sport experts. Controls established by the proposal are to alleviate concerns that the lessons will be used to circumvent the principles behind the Division III tryout prohibition. It should be noted that the original proposal recommendation included only golf and tennis. The Presidents and Management Councils expanded the proposal to all cover sports because of the Division III commitment to sport equity.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council intends to consider sponsoring an amendment-to-amendment at its January pre-Convention meeting that would limit this proposal to golf and tennis.

Action: Adopted, 313-85-6.

***NO. 3 (NO. 2-12) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF COMPETITION**

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete shall use a season of eligibility when he or she participates in any regular-season competition (including scrimmages occurring after the first contest or date of competition and competition in the nontraditional segment) or postseason intercollegiate competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, page 92, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of *Participation Competition*. A season of intercollegiate *participation competition* shall be counted when a student-athlete participates (*practices or competes*) *during or after the first contest following the student-athlete's initial participation at that institution in any regular-season competition (including scrimmages occurring after the first contest or date of competition and competition in the nontraditional segment) or postseason intercollegiate competition*. A season of *participation competition* shall not be counted when a student-athlete participates in a preseason scrimmage or preseason exhibition *conducted prior to the first contest following the student-athlete's initial participation at that institution*. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics competition conducted by a *Division III* **any** collegiate institution at the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team level.”

[Note: use of the phrase “season of participation” shall be replaced with “season of competition” throughout the Manual.]

Source: Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference, Keene State College, Plymouth State University, Rhode Island College and University of Southern Maine.

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Recent studies indicate that a student's success and retention is directly linked to the student's connection to the university. At the majority of Division III institutions, athletics staff are extremely limited in number. Many times due to financial considerations, or a desire to concentrate more on academics, a “redshirt” year is critically supportive to the student-athlete's personal well-being and academic success. This issue is one that was overwhelmingly supported by the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association and by the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at the 2004 NCAA Convention. We created the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association as well as the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and each group's voice should be heard.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Management Council): The Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal as it is in direct conflict with the reform measures adopted at the 2004 Convention. Division III student-athletes should not be encouraged to extend their academic experience to facilitate their athletics experience. The current rule has adequate flexibility to address special circumstances like study abroad and student-teaching.

Action: Defeated, 277-128-1.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-13) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION — PARTICIPATION AT ANY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION**

Intent: To specify that participation at any collegiate institution shall constitute the use of a season of eligibility.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, page 92, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Participation. A season of intercollegiate participation shall be counted when a student-athlete participates (practices or competes) during or after the first contest following the student-athlete’s initial participation at that institution. A season of participation shall not be counted when a student-athlete participates in a preseason scrimmage or pre-season exhibition conducted prior to the first contest following the student-athlete’s initial participation at that institution. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics participation (practice or competition) conducted by a *Division III* any collegiate institution at the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team level.

Source: Midwest Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Historically the Midwest Conference has been opposed to redshirting. At the 2004 NCAA Convention Division III members agreed that redshirting is unacceptable based on the adoption of season-of-participation legislation, yet student-athletes outside of Division III are treated differently and allowed to retain a year of competition by redshirting. This practice should not be permissible for those Division I and II student-athletes who decide to transfer to a Division III institution. The playing field should remain fair and consistent for all athletes within Division III. Transferring student-athletes should make decisions not to increase playing time, but because they have decided that an academic program offered by a small college or a different campus environment is in their present and future best interests. This proposal should not be viewed as a penalty for student-athletes who participate in Divisions I and II, but an affirmation that Division III is intent on permitting four years of participation for any student-athlete.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council supports this proposal as it applies a consistent season of eligibility standard to all student-athletes in Division III, regardless of prior participation at a non-Division III institution. With this proposal, the student-athlete becomes accountable for the decision to “redshirt” prior to attending a Division III institution.

Action: Defeated, 203-199-4.

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-11) ELIGIBILITY — GRADUATE
STUDENT/POSTBACCALAUREATE
PARTICIPATION — EXCEPTION**

[Note: The Presidents Council withdrew this proposal at its October meeting.]

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who has earned a baccalaureate degree at a four-year institution be immediately eligible on transfer to the certifying institution, provided the student-athlete has at least one season of participation remaining, meets an exception to the transfer residence requirement and has more than two semesters or three quarters of eligibility remaining pursuant to the 10-semester/15-quarter rule.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.9 by adding new 14.1.9.1, page 91, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"14.1.9 Graduate Student/Postbaccalaureate Participation. A student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate (regardless of whether the individual has received a United States baccalaureate degree or its equivalent), a student-athlete who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, or a student-athlete who has graduated and is continuing as a full-time student at the same institution while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree as defined and documented by the institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable 10-semester/15-quarter period set forth in Bylaw 14.2.

"14.1.9.1 Exception. A student-athlete who has earned a baccalaureate degree at any four-year institution and is enrolled in an institution other than the institution from which he or she earned the degree may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has at least one season of participation remaining, meets an exception to the transfer residence requirement (see Bylaw 14.5.1.1) and has more than two semesters or three quarters of eligibility remaining pursuant to the 10-semester/15-quarter rule."

[14.1.9.1 through 14.1.9.2 renumbered as 14.1.9.2 through 14.1.9.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Administrative Review Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Colleges and universities in Division III place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. A related tenet of Division III is to provide student-athletes the opportunity to

complete four seasons of athletics participation within a four academic-year period. This proposal rewards and recognizes the unique situation a student-athlete encounters when he or she graduates in less than four academic years and provides those students with a complete four academic year athletics experience.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council has withdrawn this proposal and re-emphasized the authority of the Administrative Review Subcommittee to review the eligibility of graduate students and grant waivers on a case-by-case basis.

Action: Referred to Division III Management Council.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-25) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP — MINIMUM CONTEST REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To revise the minimum contest requirements for sports sponsorship to 70 percent of the division-wide average number of completed contests, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3.3, pages 217-218, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.11.3.3 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution’s team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against the varsity programs of four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution’s team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contests requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Team Sports	Minimum Contests	Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
Baseball	12 25	Cross Country	5	5
Basketball	18	<i>Men’s Fencing</i>	6	5
Field Hockey	8 12	<i>Women’s Fencing</i>	6 8	5
Football	8 7	Golf	7 6	5
Ice Hockey	12 18	Men’s Gymnastics	6	6
Lacrosse	8 10	Women’s Gymnastics	6	5
Women’s Rowing	5 8	Rifle	8 6	4
Women’s Rugby	8	Skiing	5	5
Soccer	8 13	Swimming and Diving	6 8	8
Softball	12 24	Tennis	7 10	6
Volleyball	8 17	Track & Field, Indoor	5	10
Water Polo	12 13	Track & Field, Outdoor	5 6	12
		Wrestling	7	6

“(Note: The minimum-contest requirements set forth in Bylaws 20.11.3.3.1 through 20.11.3.3.8 apply only to the provisions of

this section and do not apply to minimum-contest requirements in Bylaw 14 and Bylaw 17.)

[20.11.3.3.1 through 20.11.3.3.7 unchanged.]

“20.11.3.3.8 Indoor and Outdoor Track and Field. An institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track and field, provided its team participates in a total of at least **10 11** indoor and outdoor meets during the year, including at least three indoor and three outdoor meets.”

[Remainder of 20.11.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Institutions sponsoring varsity intercollegiate sports should demonstrate a legitimate commitment to the sport program and a quality student-athlete experience. In order to demonstrate this commitment, Division III members should conduct a number of contests that represents legitimate sponsorship of the sport. Using 70 percent of the average number of completed Division III contests for sports sponsorship minimums reflects a fair and consistent way to determine an appropriate number and replaces the historic piecemeal establishment of minimum contest requirements. To establish the minimums in this proposal, the Division III Membership Committee used data submitted by institutions for the NCAA sport sponsorship report. Note that emerging sports are excluded from the proposal because of low sponsorship levels, and that, where necessary, downward adjustments have been made to ensure consistency between men's and women's minimums in the same sport. The Membership Committee will review the average contest figures every three years and update the minimum contest requirements based on that review. This proposal used the most recent data available and is based on completed contests during the years 2001-02 through 2003-04. The delayed effective date of August 1, 2007, will give institutions one year to adjust contest schedules. Finally, the proposal is related to the study of the future of Division III as it focuses on meaningful sports sponsorship.

Action: Adopted, 318-84-2.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-23) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT**

Intent: To increase the required number of sports sponsored to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from 10 to 14 based on institutional enrollment, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3, page 217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.11.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member institution shall sponsor in Division III a minimum **number of: sports based on insti-**

tutional enrollment according to Figure 20-2. All sports used to meet the minimum sports sponsorship requirements must meet the minimum contest and participant requirements per Bylaw 20.11.3.5. Further, all institutions must sponsor a minimum of

- “(a) Five varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least three team sports, *based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.11.3.3* and **at least one sport per season** involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females; and
- “(b) Five varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least three team sports, *based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.11.3.3* and **at least one sport per season** involving all-female teams, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 3.2.4.12.4.

“20.11.3.1 Calculation of Enrollment Figure. Institutional enrollment for sports sponsorship requirements shall be based on a rolling four-year average using the full-time undergraduate enrollment figure submitted for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). The institution shall sponsor the required number of sports the academic year following the October EADA submission.

“20.11.3.2 Single Gender Institution — Exception. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one gender are not required to meet the sports sponsorship requirements for the other gender. Single gender institutions shall sponsor half the number of sports at each enrollment level and may round the fractional number down.

[20.11.3.1 through 20.11.3.3 renumbered as 20.11.3.3 through 20.11.3.5, unchanged.]

“Figure 20-2

“Enrollment	Minimum Sports Sponsorship
“1400 or more	14
“1300-1399	13
“1200-1299	12
“1100-1199	11
“1099 or less	10”

Source: North Coast Athletic Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2010

Rationale: This proposal seeks to better match Division III philosophy with the actual practice of sports sponsorship, bringing the required number of sports sponsored in line with the current institutional average of 16.4. Members of a playing division ought to be more alike than dissimilar. The minimum number of sports sponsored needs to reflect the current commitment of most members. By encouraging institutions to sponsor a broad-

based program, commensurate with size, the proposal makes all the members more alike. Common interest lies at the heart of all efforts to pass legislation that equally serves all members of the Division, just as dissimilarity makes it difficult to legislate equitably. Division III is unusual, with many institutions having small enrollments (250-1,099). This proposal protects these institutions by allowing them to meet the existing standard. The proposal shows flexibility by matching minimum sports sponsorship to institutional size, adding sports as enrollment grows in multiples of 100 from 1,000 to 1,400. A hearing process is established to consider legitimate exceptions for truly unique situations. This proposal reconciles the current disparity in sports sponsorship and enables all members to practice the Division III philosophy: "...encouraging participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students." It should be noted that the requirement to sponsor one sport in each season is not being created by this proposal. That requirement exists under current regulations and is being moved to this section of Bylaw 20 as part of this proposal.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Management Council): The Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal, noting that an increase to 14 sports may be too burdensome for some institutions, and that it may not be appropriate to expect one additional sports team per 100 students for the affected enrollment levels.

Action: Defeated, 371-37-3.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-24) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP — SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT — SIX SPORTS FOR MALES/MIXED AND FEMALE TEAMS**

Intent: To increase the required number of sports an institution must sponsor to achieve or maintain active Division III membership from five to six per gender for institutions with enrollment greater than 1,000 students.

Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3, page 217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"20.11.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member institution shall sponsor in Division III a minimum **number of: sports based on institutional enrollment. At least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in every sport season. All sports used to meet the minimum sports sponsorship requirements must meet the minimum contest and participant requirements per Bylaw 20.11.3.7.**

"20.11.3.1 Institution with Enrollment of 1,000 Students or Less.

“(a) An institution with enrollment of 1,000 students or less shall sponsor *Five* varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least three team sports, *based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.11.3.3 and* involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females; and

“(b) Five varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least three team sports, *based on the minimum requirements of Bylaw 20.11.3.3 and* involving all-female teams, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 3.2.4.12.4.

“20.11.3.2 Institution with Enrollment over 1,000 Students. An institution with enrollment over 1,000 students shall sponsor six varsity collegiate sports, including at least three team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females; and six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least three sports, involving all-female teams, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 3.2.4.12.4.

“20.11.3.3 Single Gender Institution — Exception. An institution that sponsors and conducts athletics programs for only one gender are not required to meet the sports sponsorship requirement for the other gender.

“20.11.3.4 Calculation of Enrollment Figures. Institutional enrollment for sports sponsorship requirements shall be based on a rolling four-year average using the full-time undergraduate enrollment figure submitted for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). The institution shall sponsor the required number of sports the academic year following the October EADA submission.”

[20.11.3.1 through 20.11.3.3 renumbered as 20.11.3.5 through 20.11.3.7, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2010

Rationale: The Division III Philosophy Statement states that each institution should “encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students.” Sports sponsorship is a direct reflection of an institution’s commitment to this broad-based philosophy and was an area under review in the study of the future of Division III. Increasing minimum sponsorship numbers to six sports for males or mixed teams and six sports for female team is more reflective of the division-wide average commitment of eight sports per gender. Approximately one-fourth of the Division III membership has undergraduate enrollment less than 1,000. Exempting those schools recognizes that enrollment is an important factor in determining what constitutes a broad-based program. The four-year delayed effective date will give each of the approximately 20 schools that currently would be affected by this

proposal adequate time to prepare for its implementation and is similar to the delayed effective date successfully employed when minimums were last raised from four and four to five and five. It should be noted that the sports sponsorship waiver remains an avenue for institution to be provided relief when unique circumstances warrant such action. The membership committee shall consider the percentage of student-athletes in the student body when considering these waivers, noting that 16 percent is the average for the division. It should be noted that this proposal does not create the requirement to sponsor at least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team in every sport season and that all sports used to meet the minimum sports sponsorship requirements must meet the minimum contest and participant requirements per Bylaw 20.11.3.7. Those requirements have just been moved into this bylaw in conjunction with this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 233-170-5.

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-21) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP —
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT —
INTEGRATION OF ADMINISTRATION —
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE —
ADMISSION POLICIES**

Intent: To amend the Division III philosophy statement to note that coaches play a significant role as educators, to indicate that academic performance of student-athletes should be, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body, that admissions policies and procedures for student-athletes should be consistent with those applicable to the general student body, and that the administration of the institution's athletics program should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.11, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

"DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

"Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience, **and in which coaches play a significant role as educators.** They also seek to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff."

[Remainder of 20.11 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.11, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

“DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

[20.11-(a) through 20.11-(f) unchanged.]

“(g) Assume that athletics programs support the institution’s educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. **Further, the administration of an institution’s athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission;**”

[Remainder of 20.11 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.11 by adding new 20.11-(i), pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

“DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

[20.11-(a) through 20.11-(h) unchanged.]

“(i) **Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student-body;**”

[20.11-(i) through 20.11-(l) renumbered as 20.11-(j) through 20.11-(m), unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 20.11 by adding new 20.11-(j), pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

“DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

[20.11-(a) through 20.11-(i) unchanged.]

“(j) **Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body;**”

[20.11-(j) through 20.11-(l) renumbered as 20.11-(k) through 20.11-(m), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Future of Division III Phase II Oversight Group).

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal reflects the results of the 2004 membership survey regarding the future of Division III and other membership feedback received during the past year. More than 84 percent of survey respondents supported items from the existing philosophy statement relating to integration. This proposal defines how athlet-

ics administrators can be integrated into the campus community and specifically recognizes the important role of coaches as educators of student-athletes. This proposal highlights the view that student-athletes should be integrated into the campus culture, and should also perform at least as well academically as their campus peers. One hundred percent of the membership responded in support of the current philosophical prong to place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. Further, approximately 90 percent of respondents indicated that this philosophical basis should be addressed at the institutional level, a point reinforced by this proposal as consistency in academic performance shall be based on and measured by institutional standards. Finally, to help accomplish important academic and integration goals, an institution should have an appropriate population of student-athletes based on institutional mission. As such, the philosophy statement should highlight the premise that student-athlete admission practices should be consistent with those for the general student body in a manner defined by institutional standards.

Action: Adopted, 403-2-1.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-22) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP —
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT —
ELIMINATION OF IN-REGION
COMPETITION EMPHASIS**

Intent: To eliminate the emphasis on in-region competition within the Division III philosophy statement and the championships selection process for all Division III team sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.11, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS. DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT. "Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience. They also seek to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff.

"To achieve this end, Division III institutions:

[20.11-(a) through 20.11-(j) unchanged.]

"(k) *Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships* **Support institutional autonomy at all levels of athletics competition, including scheduling principles and championships aspiration and participation;** and

[Remainder of 20.11 unchanged.]

B. Administrative: Amend 31.3.1.1, page 253, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.1.1 Eligibility for Berths. Pools A, B and C will be determined as follows:

[31.3.1.1-(a) through 31.3.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) Pool C. The bracket size minus the number of Pool A and Pool B berths. This would be a national selection based on *a team’s win-loss record within its region and conference* **the selection criteria per Bylaw 31.3.5.2.** For example, a bracket of 48 minus (Pool A + Pool B) = Pool C.”

C. Administrative: Amend 31.3.2.1, page 253, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.2.1 Pairings and Site Selection. The following criteria will be used for pairings and site selections:

[31.3.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Teams may be seeded **based** on *a regional basis using the regional-* **the selection criteria per Bylaw 31.3.5.2.** However, geographic proximity shall take precedent over seeding.”

[31.3.2.1-(c) through 31.3.2.1-(d) unchanged.]

D. Administrative: Amend 31.3.3, page 254, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.3 Criteria for Selection of Participants.

[31.3.3.1 unchanged.]

“31.3.3.2 *In-Region Opponents. An institution must play at least 50 percent of its competition against in-region opponents to be eligible for selection to Division III team championships.*

“31.3.3.2.1 *Waiver. Institutions that fail to play 50 percent of contests against in-region opponents may appeal to the Championships Committee for a waiver. The waiver shall be approved for period of one year, and the request shall be received one year in advance of the championship. If the Championships Committee grants the appeal, the institution may be considered for selection to Division III team championships.*”

[31.3.3.3 through 31.3.3.6 renumbered as 31.3.3.2 through 31.3.3.5, unchanged.]

E. Administrative: Amend 31.3.5.1, pages 256-257, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.5 Selection of Balance of Championship Field. Once the official representative(s) of each qualifying conference is determined, the governing sports committee responsible for selection of the balance of the championship field shall consider objective-ly and without prejudice the competitive records of all other eligible student-athletes and teams (including independent insti-

tutions, representatives of conferences not receiving automatic qualification and representatives of the other members of the conferences receiving automatic qualification). To the best of its ability, the committee shall select the most highly qualified individuals and teams to complete the championship field in accordance with the *regional* criteria approved for the particular championship and additional selection pools, if any, approved by the Championships Committee.

“31.3.5.1 Selections of Berths. After the determination of the automatic pool (Pool A) berths, the governing sports committee responsible for the selection of the balance of the championship field shall determine the Pool B selection followed by the Pool C selections. Pool C is reserved for institutions in conferences with automatic qualification that are not the conference champions plus remaining independents and members for nonqualifying conferences. Berths for Pool B and Pool C shall be selected on a national basis, using *regional-applicable* selection criteria. *There shall be no predetermined regional allocations for Pools B and C. There shall be no maximum or minimum number of berths from one region and n*No conference shall receive more than one automatic berth.

“31.3.5.2 Selection Criteria. The governing sports committee responsible for the selection of the balance of the championships field shall select teams in Pools B and C based on the criteria below. The criteria of two or more teams shall be compared to determine the higher ranked team. An attempt shall be made to determine the ranking of two or more teams after consideration of the primary criteria (see Bylaw 31.3.5.2.1). If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the secondary criteria will be used (see Bylaw 31.3.5.2.2). All the criteria listed will be evaluated (not listed in preferential order).

“31.3.5.2.1 Primary Criteria — Ranking and Selection (All Contests Leading up to NCAA Championships).

“(a) Won-lost percentage against *regional all* opponents;

[31.3.5.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *In-region h*Head-to-head competition;

“(d) *In-region r*Results versus common *regional* opponents; and

“(e) *In-region r*Results versus *regionally* ranked teams will be considered as follows:

“(1) Opponents are considered ranked once they appear one time in the sport’s official rankings; and

“(2) Conference postseason contests are included.

“31.3.5.2.2 Secondary Criteria—For Ranking and Selection.

“(a) *Out-of-region h*Head-to-head competition;”

[31.3.5.2.2-(b) through 31.3.5.5-(h) unchanged.]

Source: College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, Northwest Conference and University Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: The regional competition emphasis in the championships selection process has adversely affected many Division III institutions. First, this emphasis has prevented institutions with National Championship aspirations from scheduling games outside of their region, including areas valuable to enrollment generation. Second, schools are forced to play in-region games against lesser quality teams simply because the games are considered to be in-region. Often, such games do not provide any benefit to either team other than being considered in-region games. Third, teams that have been historically successful in certain regions now struggle to find in-region games and must now look outside their region, impacting championship possibilities. Finally, the Division III philosophy statement declares that the purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own objectives and programs. The current in-region emphasis is contrary to that statement as it handcuffs schools aspiring to NCAA championships. This change supports the basic premise that 'a game is a game' regardless of location and enables schools to choose where and against whom they will play in conjunction with their own institutional objectives.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee oppose this proposal, noting that the future of Division III survey found 75 percent support for the emphasis on in-region competition. The governance structure supports the Division III philosophy statement as written, and as such, continues to affirm placing emphasis on in-region competition for championships selection purposes. The committee does encourage institutions to provide educational experiences in the form of out-of-region trips for their student-athletes if they so choose, with the understanding that they are doing it for the experience and not for selection purposes. The governance structure will continue to explore additional flexibility in the application of the regional concept to championships selection criteria.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 11 (NO. 2-28) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION — MAXIMUM SIZE OF CHAMPIONSHIPS FIELDS**

Intent: In team sports other than football, to establish a maximum bracket size of 64; further, in football, to specify a maximum bracket size of 32.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.4 by adding new 31.3.4.4.1, page 256, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.4.4 Principles of Establishing Bracket Sizes. In team sports, overall bracket sizes shall be established based on an approximate access ratio of 1:6.5. In golf and tennis, the team portion of the bracket shall be based on an approximate access ratio of 1:7.5 and the individual participant access shall be determined according to Championship Committee policy. **See Bylaw 31.3.4.4.1 for maximum bracket sizes.** The overall team bracket size shall be determined by dividing the total number of active Division III institutions sponsoring the sport by 6.5 or 7.5 and then adjusted as necessary by the Championships Committee. Bracket composition shall be based on three pools (A, B and C) and shall be established using the following principles:
[31.3.4.4-(a) through 31.3.4.4-(c) unchanged.]

“31.3.4.4.1 Maximum Bracket Size. In team sports other than football, there shall be a maximum bracket size of 64. In football, there shall be a maximum bracket size of 32.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Future of Division III Phase II Oversight Group).

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal establishes a maximum size for championship brackets in light of the continued growth of Division III and is a result of the study of the future of Division III. A 64-team bracket is sensitive to missed class time in that the related championship can be conducted within a three week period (with the exception of football). This proposal will help the championships committee appropriately plan for future championships by eliminating the uncertainty regarding potentially cumbersome brackets. The current bracket size formula will be honored until the growth of sports sponsorship makes it necessary to implement the cap. The football bracket shall not exceed 32 as that championship takes five weeks to conduct at its current field size.

Action: Adopted, 391-20-0.

***NO. 12 (NO. 2-1) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP — MAXIMUM CAPACITY**

Intent: To establish a maximum number of active, provisional and reclassifying Division III members as of June 1, 2006; further, to permit all exploratory members as of September 1, 2005, to be included in the membership total and to permit those current NCAA members of Divisions I and II which may choose to reclassify their institutions into Division III as of June 1, 2006, to be included in the membership total.

Constitution: Amend 3.1, page 8, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“3.1 ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.

“3.1.1 General. Membership is available to colleges, universities, athletics conferences or associations and other groups that are related to intercollegiate athletics; that have acceptable academic standards (as defined in Constitution 3.2.3.3), and that are located in the United States, its territories or possessions. Such institutions or organizations must accept and observe the principles set forth in the constitution and bylaws of the Association.

“3.1.1.1 Maximum Size of Division III Membership. The size of the Division III membership shall not exceed the total number of all the following institutions:

“(a) Active members of Division III as of September 1, 2005;

“(b) Provisional members of Division III as of September 1, 2005;

“(c) Institutions that have submitted application for Division III exploratory membership as of September 1, 2005; and

“(d) Division I and II members that submit application to reclassify as of June 1, 2006.”

[Note: The above paragraphs will be replaced by an actual number as of June 1, 2006.]

[3.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: North Coast Athletic Conference

Effective Date: Immediate (for provisional or exploratory institutions); June 1, 2006 (for Division I or II institutions that submit reclassification applications on or before June 1, 2006).

Rationale: Division III has experienced unprecedented growth since its inception in 1973, growing from 243 to 450 members and is the largest playing division (by more than 100) in NCAA history. Its membership eclipses the NAIA, at 335 members. Conferences have also increased from 30 to 44 in the last seven years. This growth has actually caused the Division III championships committee to propose the permanent capping of team sports championship fields to 64 teams due to the time it takes to conduct tournaments. Championships already infringe on the academic calendar, and growth will require the hiring of more NCAA staff. The unprecedented number of members and conferences will also begin to strain the limited resources of staff and revenue allotted to Division III by Association formula. This proposal poses the fundamental question for our future: “How large a membership do we want for Division III and why?” Therefore, the sponsors feel a permanent membership cap for Division III would: (a) effectively serve as a component of a long-range

plan for our Division; (b) protect access to NCAA championship fields; (c) stabilize and protect current levels of NCAA staff services; and (d) preserve our limited percentage of the Association's revenue for future operations.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council supports this proposal, with the following conditions: (1) the Executive Committee will establish a multi-division working group to address Association-wide membership issues, with recommendations due no later than January 2007; (2) the Council has established a moratorium on new membership, effective immediately and lasting through the 2007 Convention. The moratorium does not apply to institutions in the exploratory or provisional membership process as of September 1, 2005, and reclassifying members as of June 1, 2006, consistent with the intent of this proposal; and (3) any action on this proposal should be deferred to the 2007 Convention.

Action: Referred to NCAA Executive Committee Working Group to Study Membership Issues.

***NO. 13 (NO. 2-2) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP AND CHAMPIONSHIPS SELECTION — MEMBER CONFERENCE — SELF-STUDY GUIDE AND LIMITED REALIGNMENT PERIOD**

Intent: To require that conferences conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation at least once every five years, using a Conference Self-Study Guide; further, to specify that for a two-year period, a conference that completes the self-study may remain eligible for automatic qualification during a two-year period without satisfying the seven institution minimum requirement or continuity of membership requirement, as specified.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.3.4 by adding new 3.3.4.6, page 14, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“3.3.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership.

[3.3.4.1 through 3.3.4.5 unchanged.]

“3.3.4.6 Self-Study Report. Conferences shall conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of their intercollegiate athletics programs at least once every five years, using the Conference Self-Study Guide (CSSG). The report of the self-study and supporting documentation shall be available for examination on request by the Division III Membership Committee. Failure to submit the self-study may result in the conference's loss of Division III strategic initiative funding. Subjects covered by the self-study shall include:

“(a) Institutional mission;

“(b) Conference philosophy;

- “(c) Academic profiles;
- “(d) Geographic proximity;
- “(e) Athletics profile;
- “(f) Diversity;
- “(g) President or chancellor involvement;
- “(h) Conference governance, including the role of athletics directors, faculty athletics representatives and senior woman administrators;
- “(i) Student-Athlete Advisory Committee activity;
- “(j) Financial Aid Annual Electronic Reporting Process;
- “(k) Convention attendance;
- “(l) Rules compliance; and
- “(m) Commitment to citizenship, leadership and sportsmanship.”

B. Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.2 by adding new 31.3.4.2.1, pages 255-256, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.4.2 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

[31.3.4.2-(a) through 31.3.4.2-(b) unchanged.]

“31.3.4.2.1 Exception for Two-Year Waiting Period. Beginning August 1, 2008, and ending August 1, 2010, Division III conferences that have completed the self-study per Constitution 3.3.4.6 shall not be required to comply with the two-year waiting period to be eligible for automatic qualification. This exception shall apply to existing conferences that do not meet the seven institution minimum requirement and/or the continuity of membership requirement, as long as the conference maintains at least four core members from the most previous academic year. The conference must meet all other additional requirements to be eligible for automatic qualification.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Future of Division III Phase II Oversight Group).

Effective Date: August 1, 2006, to begin the two-year window for completion of the first self-study; August 1, 2008, for relief of the seven institution minimum and continuity of membership requirements.

Rationale: The concept of a conference self-study guide and related realignment window originated with the study of the future of Division III. This self-study process will improve conference operations by encouraging dialogue on issues of importance to all conferences and will ensure that conferences are aligned for more reasons than just automatic qualification. The NCAA provides many benefits to its member conferences, including automatic access to championships and a large

compliment of grants, initiative funds and educational opportunities for student-athletes and athletics personnel. This proposal establishes expectations and accountability for conferences receiving those benefits. In order to be effective, it is imperative that an inclusive group of individuals participate in this self-study process. The self-study instrument shall be released by August 1, 2006, and all conferences shall submit notification of completion by August 1, 2008. Based on the results of the self-study, if a conference determines that its current membership is not appropriate to meet conference goals and expectations, the conference and its members shall have a two-year window of August 1, 2008, until August 1, 2010, to realign and seek new members without loss of automatic qualification. In this way, the conference can establish membership goals separate from concerns to maintain the automatic bid.

Action: Adopted, 244-148-12.

***NO. 14 (NO. 2-26) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION —
CONFERENCE REALIGNMENT PERIOD**

Intent: To permit a new conference to be eligible for automatic qualification for a limited time period, as specified.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.2 by adding new 31.3.4.2.1, pages 255-256, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.4.2 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

[31.3.4.2-(a) through 31.3.4.2-(b) unchanged.]

“31.3.4.2.1 Exception. Beginning August 1, 2007, and ending August 1, 2009, any new conference that includes a majority of members from a conference that was eligible for automatic qualification during the most recent academic year is not subject to the two year waiting period to be eligible for automatic qualification. Further, the conference shall not be required to have conducted competition for the sport in question for a two-year period to be immediately eligible for automatic qualification. For purposes of this regulation, a new conference is one that includes no more than four institutions that belonged to the same conference during the most recent academic year.”

Source: Commonwealth Coast Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: In New England, there are multiple Division III conferences and some independent schools seeking membership into NCAA conferences. The conferences are getting large, however, and the conference memberships were originally established around automatic qualifiers without careful examination of

matching school's missions, academic philosophies and athletics programs. We would like the opportunity to have a discussion among the New England conferences and schools to restructure and realign the conferences. If we decide to realign and perhaps add an additional conference, we do not want to be hindered in our discussions by limiting participation in conferences with automatic qualification for schools that have been members of conferences with automatic qualification. A realignment, we believe, would benefit the student-athletes' experience.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee oppose this proposal as it does not establish any standards for conference self-study prior to conference realignment.

Action: Defeated, 324-79-4.

***NO. 15 (NO. 2-27) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
SELECTION OF TEAMS AND
INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS
PARTICIPATION — AUTOMATIC
QUALIFICATION — SEVEN
INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT — TWO-
YEAR GRACE PERIOD**

Intent: To provide conferences with automatic qualification status a two academic-year grace period to meet the minimum member sponsorship requirement of seven teams, should the conference fall below that minimum; further, to specify that if the conference falls below four core institutions, the grace period would become void and the conference would lose its automatic qualification status.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.4.2, pages 255-256, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.4.2 Additional Requirements. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification, the conference must have:

- “(a) Been a multi-sport conference with a minimum of seven institutions sponsoring the specified sport. Those seven institutions must have belonged to the multi-sport conference for a minimum of two years in order for the conference to be immediately eligible for automatic qualification. An institution that has belonged to the multi-sport conference for at least two years may add the specified sport for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions and to be immediately eligible for an automatic qualification. If a new institution joins the conference in order for the conference to reach the minimum of seven institutions sponsoring the particular sport, the conference is subject to a two-year waiting period to become eligible for automatic qualification; or

“(1) Grace Period. A conference shall remain eligible for automatic qualification for two academic years following the date of withdrawal of the institution(s) that cause(s) the conference’s membership to fall below seven institutions in a particular sport. If the conference fails to meet the minimum sponsorship requirement after the two-year grace period, or if less than four core institutions [per Bylaw 31.3.4.2-(b)-(3)-(a)] sponsor the sport at any point, the conference will lose automatic qualification status until it again meets all requirements for automatic qualification.

“(b) Fulfilled all of the following requirements:

“(1) Been a member conference of the Association for two consecutive academic years. No waivers of the two-year waiting period shall be granted;

“(2) Conducted competition in the sport in question for a two-year waiting period at the time of its application for automatic qualification;

“(a) A multi-sport conference that is in the process of fulfilling the two-year waiting period must maintain seven consistent conference members throughout the two-year waiting period.

“(b) The two-year waiting period begins when a minimum of seven consistent conference members are all eligible for the conference membership.

“(3) At least seven active Division III members that sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis and that are eligible for the NCAA Division III championship, and have at least seven active members that are eligible for the NCAA Division III championship to participate in the process that determines the automatic qualifier. Further, multi-sport conferences must have at least four core institutions;

“(a) For the purposes of this legislation, core refers to an institution that participates in conference competition in more than one sport in the conference seeking automatic qualification [See Bylaw 31.3.4.2-(e)].

“(b) Other Division III institutions, including those who participate in conference competition only in one sport, may fulfill the remaining sponsoring institutions needed by a conference for automatic qualification (i.e., to get a total of seven institutions). Non-NCAA Division III members of a conference may not count toward the minimum of four core institutions or the overall minimum of seven conference members that is needed; and

“(4) At least 50 percent of a conference’s members must

sponsor a minimum of three men's and three women's team sports. As of August 1, 2003, a single-sport conference in existence before February 1, 1998, must maintain its membership (e.g., minimum of seven original members).

- “(5) Grace Period. A conference shall remain eligible for automatic qualification for two academic years following the date of withdrawal of the institution(s) that cause(s) the conference’s membership to fall below seven institutions in a particular sport. If the conference fails to meet the minimum sponsorship requirement after the two-year grace period, or if less than four core institutions [per Bylaw 31.3.4.2-(b)-(3)-(a)] sponsor the sport at any point, the conference will lose automatic qualification status until it again meets all requirements for automatic qualification.”**

Source: Empire 8

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal provides conferences with automatic qualification status a two-year (academic) grace period to meet the minimum member sponsorship requirements of seven teams should it fall below that minimum. The conference would retain automatic qualification status during this period. If it reaches the minimum within two academic years, the conference and its new members shall retain the automatic qualification. If the conference fails to meet the requirement after the two-year grace period, they will lose the automatic qualification and must meet all other requirements to regain automatic qualification status. The grace period allows a conference to seek new members based on similar philosophies rather than out of convenience or a desire to beat a legislative deadline in order to maintain quality competitive opportunities for student-athletes. This proposal supports a true long-term commitment by partnering conference and institution(s) and provides protection to conferences that dip below the minimum. Conferences may fall below the requirement if an institution cuts a program due to financial or other reasons or if a member withdraws from the conference. Under current legislation, the remaining institutions and its student-athletes, who are not at fault for losing automatic qualification status, are penalized. This proposal provides reasonable relief for conferences, member institutions and student-athletes.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee oppose this proposal as it does not establish any standards for conference self-study prior to potential conference realignment.

Action: Defeated, 212-194-3. Motion to reconsider adopted, 254-133-1. Adopted upon reconsideration, 228-155-2.

***NO. 16 (NO. 2-29) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
SELECTION OF TEAMS AND
INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS
PARTICIPATION — PRIMARY CRITERIA
— RANKING AND SELECTION —
STRENGTH-OF-SEASON INDEX**

Intent: To specify that the primary selection criteria for Pools B and C must include the results of the statistical standing compilation based on the strength-of-season index.

Administrative: Amend 31.3.5.2.1, page 257, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.5.2.1 Primary Criteria — Ranking and Selection (All Con- tests Leading up to NCAA Championships).

[31.3.5.2.1-(a) through 31.3.5.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) Results of statistical standing compilation based on strength-of-season index for conferences;”

[31.3.5.2.1-(c) through 31.3.5.2.1-(e) renumbered as 31.3.5.2.1-(d) through 31.3.5.2.1-(f) unchanged.]

Source: Ohio Athletic Conference, College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin and Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Currently there are not enough quality primary criteria to assist sports committees in making very difficult Pools B and C selections. Creating a strength-of-season criterion would give committees another meaningful and objective reference. This component would also reward, not penalize, institutions who play in a more difficult league in any particular year. This index will not affect independents, positively or negatively, since they will not have a conference reference point. The delayed effective date provides the Division III Championships Committee ample time to develop this index.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee oppose this proposal. The Championships Committee has requested feedback from all team sport committees regarding implementation of opponents’ average winning percentage as a primary criterion for ranking and selection purposes, and believes that will result in a truer comparison of strength-of-schedule between two institutions. The committee noted that opponents’ average winning percentages can be used as a comparison among any and all institutions, including independent institutions.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 17 (NO. 2-17) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
EXCEPTION TO PLAYING SEASON
LIMITATIONS AND CONTEST
EXEMPTION — POSTSEASON
CHAMPIONSHIP EVENT**

Intent: In all sports, to exclude from the declared playing and practice season one postseason championship event; further, to exempt from maximum contest limitations at least one postseason championship event, as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.02, pages 123-126, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS.

[17.02.1 through 17.02.9 unchanged.]

“17.02.10 Postseason Championship. A postseason championship event shall be a season-ending, invitational tournament scheduled to occur after a conference or independents championship and shall involve competition between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season. The sponsoring organization and requirements for selection must be established prior to the first permissible contest date for the sport. The sponsoring organization may not consist solely of the members of any single conference that has already conducted a conference championship tournament or solely of a group of independents that have already conducted an independents championship tournament.”

[17.02.10 through 17.02.13 renumbered as 17.02.11 through 17.02.14, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.7, pages 126-127, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1.7 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports.

[17.1.7-(a) through 17.1.7-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *NCAA, NCCAA or NAIA Postseason Championships Participation in Team Sports.* Neither practice for nor participation in any *NCAA, NCCAA or NAIA championship one postseason championship* event (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**) is considered part of the institution’s declared playing season. A member institution that has reason to believe it is under consideration for selection to participate in *an NCAA a postseason* championship event may continue to practice (but may not compete against outside competition) beyond its last regular-season contest, including the conference championship (if any), without counting such practice against the institution’s declared playing-season limitation until it is determined by the appropriate *committee* **selec-**

tion body whether the institution will be selected to participate in the *NCAA postseason* championship competition. **Except for the events listed below, only one week shall be excluded from the playing season:**

“(1) **NCAA Championships;**

“(2) **NAIA Championships;**

“(3) **NCCAA Championships;**

“(4) **Non-NCAA championships in sports without an NCAA championship used for sports sponsorship purposes in accordance with Bylaw 20.11.3.2.1;**

“(5) **The National Collegiate Gymnastics Association national championship; and**

“(6) **Men’s Volleyball Invitational Championship tournament.**

“(d) **Institutions not Selected for Postseason Championship.** An institution that is not selected to participate in *the NCAA championship a postseason championship event* may continue to practice or compete *until the end of that championship* only if it has time remaining in its declared playing season.

“(d e) **NCAA Postseason Championships Participation in Individual Sports.** Only appropriate squad members considered necessary for effective practice with the individual(s) preparing for *the NCAA a postseason* championship may continue to practice without counting such practice against the institution’s declared playing-season limitation;

“(e) *Post-NCAA Championships Participation. After the conclusion of an NCAA (or NAIA or NCCAA) championship in a sport, an institution may resume practice and/or competition in the sport, provided it is continuing its permissible playing season in the sport and provided the activity occurs during the academic year.*

[17.1.7-(f) unchanged.]

“(g) *Non-NCAA Postseason Championships Participation. Practice and/or competition in non-NCAA (or non-NAIA or non-NCCAA)postseason championships (e.g., an invitational tournament scheduled after a conference championship) must be counted against the institution’s declared playing-season limitation; except practice and competition for one postseason championship in each non-NCAA championship sport used for sports sponsorship purposes in accordance with Bylaw 20.11.3.2.1. In women’s gymnastics, practice for and competition in the National Collegiate Gymnastics Association national championship are exempt from the institution’s declared playing-season limitation. In men’s volleyball, practice for and competition in the Division III Men’s Volleyball Invitational Championship tournament are exempt from the institution’s declared playing-season limitation; and”*

[17.1.7-(h) renumbered as 17.1.7-(g) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.5.3, pages 135, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.2.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in archery shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.2.5.3-(a) through 17.2.5.3-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the **one postseason** archery *national governing body* championship (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**).”

[Remainder of 17.2.5.3 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3, pages 136-137, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.3.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in badminton shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.3.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the **one postseason** badminton *national governing body* championship (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**).”

[Remainder of 17.3.5.3 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5.3.1, pages 138-139, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.4.5.3.1 Traditional Segment. The maximum number of baseball contests in the traditional segment shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.4.5.3.1-(a) through 17.4.5.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *Season-Ending Tournament* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** baseball *tournament* (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship, NCCAA championship*). *A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season* **championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**).”

[Remainder of 17.4.5.3.1 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.3, page 141, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.5.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

“(a) *Postseason Tournament* **Championship**. **Contests Competition** in one *postseason basketball tournament* (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship, NCCAA championship*). *A postseason tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season* **championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**).”

[Remainder of 17.5.5.3 unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.6.5.3, page 143, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.6.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in bowling shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.6.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in *the National Collegiate Women’s Bowling one postseason bowling* championship (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.6.5.3 unchanged.]

H. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.3, page 145, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.7.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in cross country shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.7.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in *an NCAA one postseason* cross country championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.7.5.3 unchanged.]

I. Bylaws: Amend 17.9.5.3, page 147, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.9.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in fencing shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.9.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *Season-Ending Tournament* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** fencing tournament (e.g., *conference championship, regional tournament*) other than an *NCAA fencing* championship (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);

[Remainder of 17.9.5.3 unchanged.]

J. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.5.3, pages 152-153, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.11.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.11.5.3-(a) through 17.11.5.3-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) **NCAA Postseason** Championships. *Contests* **Competition** played in *the NCAA one postseason* football championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.11.5.3 unchanged.]

K. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5.3, pages 154-155, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.12.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.12.5.3-(a) through 17.12.5.3-(c) unchanged.]

“(c) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in *the NCAA one postseason* golf championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.12.5.3 unchanged.]

- L. Bylaws:** Amend 17.13.5.3, page 156, as follows:
 [Division III, roll call]
 “17.13.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of gymnastics shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):
 “(a) **NCAA Postseason Championship**. Competition in *the NCAA one postseason* gymnastics championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”
 [Remainder of 17.13.5.3 unchanged.]
- M. Bylaws:** Amend 17.14.5.3, page 158, as follows:
 [Division III, roll call]
 “17.14.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of ice hockey contests/dates of competition shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):
 [17.14.5.3-(a) through 17.14.5.3-(b) unchanged.]
 “(c) *Season-Ending Tournaments* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** ice hockey tournament (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship*). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season **championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”
 [Remainder of 17.14.5.3 unchanged.]
- N. Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.5.3.1, page 160, as follows:
 [Division III, roll call]
 “17.15.5.3.1 Traditional Segment. The maximum number of lacrosse dates of competition in the traditional segment shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):
 [17.15.5.3.1-(a) unchanged.]
 “(b) *Season-Ending Tournament* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** lacrosse tournament (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship*). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season **championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”
 [Remainder of 17.15.5.3.1 unchanged.]
- O. Bylaws:** Amend 17.16.5.3, page 162, as follows:
 [Division III, roll call]
 “17.16.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of rifle shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):
 “(a) **NCAA Postseason Championship**. Competition in *the National Collegiate Men’s and Women’s Rifle Championships* **one postseason rifle championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”
 [Remainder of 17.16.5.3 unchanged.]

- P. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.5.3, page 164, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.17.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of rowing shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.17.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in the *NCAA Division III Women’s Rowing Championship* **one postseason rowing championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);**

“(c) *United States Rowing Association Championship. Competition in the U.S. Rowing Association championship;*”

[17.17.5.3-(d) through 17.17.5.3-(i) renumbered as 17.17.5.3-(c) through 17.17.5.3-(h), unchanged.]

- Q. Bylaws:** Amend 17.18.5.3, page 165, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.18.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of contests in women’s rugby shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.18.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the **one postseason** rugby *national governing body* championship **(see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.18.5.3 unchanged.]

- R. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.3, pages 165-166, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.19.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of skiing shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

“(a) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in the *National Collegiate Men’s and Women’s Skiing Championships* **one postseason skiing championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.19.5.3 unchanged.]

- S. Bylaws:** Amend 17.20.5.3.1, page 170, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.20.5.3.1 Traditional Segment. The maximum number of soccer contests during the traditional segment shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.20.5.3.1-(a) through 17.20.5.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *Season-Ending Tournaments* **Postseason** **Championship.** Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** soccer tournament (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship, NCCAA championship*). A *season-ending* tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season **championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.20.5.3.1 unchanged.]

- T. Bylaws:** Amend 17.21.5.3.1, page 172, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.21.5.3.1 Traditional Segment. The maximum number of softball contests in the traditional segment shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.21.5.3.1-(a) through 17.21.5.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *Season-Ending Tournament* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending* **postseason** softball tournament (e.g., *NCAA championship, NAIA championship, NCCAA championship*). A *season-ending tournament* involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season **championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.21.5.3.1 unchanged.]

- U. Bylaws:** Amend 17.22.5.3, page 174, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.22.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in squash shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.22.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the **one** **postseason** squash *national governing body* championship **(see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.22.5.3 unchanged.]

- V. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23.5.3, page 176, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.23.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of swimming and diving shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-23):

[17.23.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **NCAA Postseason Championship**. Competition in the *NCAA Swimming and Diving Championships* **one** **postseason swimming and diving championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.23.5.3 unchanged.]

- W. Bylaws:** Amend 17.24.5.3, page 178, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.24.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in synchronized swimming shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.24.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the *national governing body* **one** **postseason synchronized swimming** championship **(see Bylaw 17.02.10);**”

[Remainder of 17.24.5.3 unchanged.]

- X. Bylaws:** Amend 17.25.5.3, page 180, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.25.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.25.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *National Governing Body* **Postseason** Championship Competition. Competition in the national governing body **one postseason team handball** championship (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.25.5.3 unchanged.]

Y. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.5.3, pages 182-183, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.26.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of tennis shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.26.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *NCAA* **Postseason** Championship. Competition in the *NCAA one postseason* tennis championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.11**);”

[Remainder of 17.26.5.3 unchanged.]

Z. Bylaws: Amend 17.27.5.3, page 185, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.27.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sports of indoor and outdoor track and field shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-27):

[17.27.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *NCAA* **Postseason** Championships. Competition in the *NCAA one postseason* indoor and outdoor track and field championships (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.27.5.3 unchanged.]

AA. Bylaws: Amend 17.28.10.1, pages 187-188, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.28.10.1 Traditional Segment for Women and Any Segment for Men. The maximum number of volleyball dates of competition in the traditional segment for women and any segment for men shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.28.10.1-(a) through 17.28.10.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *Season-Ending Tournament* **Postseason Championship**. Competition in one *season-ending postseason* volleyball tournament (i.e., *Molten Championship, NCAA championship, NAIA championship, National Invitational Volleyball Championship and NCCAA championship*). A *season-ending tournament* involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season **championship** (see **Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.28.10.1 unchanged.]

BB. Bylaws: Amend 17.29.8.3, page 190, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.29.8.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of water polo shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.29.8.3-(a) through 17.29.8.3-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) **NCAA Postseason** Championship—*Men. Competition in the National Collegiate Men’s Water Polo Championship;*

“(d) *NCAA Championship—Women. Competition in the National Collegiate Women’s Water Polo Championship.* **one postseason water polo championship (see Bylaw 17.02.10);”**

[17.29.8.3-(e) through 17.29.8.3-(k) renumbered as 17.29.8.3-(d) through 17.29.8.3-(j), unchanged.]

CC. Bylaws: Amend 17.30.5.3, page 189, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.30.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of wrestling shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.30.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **NCAA Postseason** Championship. Competition in *the NCAA one postseason* wrestling championships (**see Bylaw 17.02.10**);”

[Remainder of 17.30.5.3 unchanged.]

Source: Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, Empire 8 and New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: The NCAA has long allowed institutions to exempt participation in at least one postseason tournament from being counted against their maximum contest limitations (e.g., NCAA, NCCAA, NAIA, ECAC, USCAA, and various national governing body championships.) Exceptions for a number of other tournaments have also been granted on a sport-by-sport basis. Participation in some season-ending tournaments is also exempt from counting in the playing-season limitations. Exceptions to the playing-season limitations suddenly became more important two years ago when the seasons were reduced to 18 or 19 weeks. Consequently, schools involved in non-NCAA/NAIA/NCCAA championships now have to “save” a week on the chance that they might be selected to participate. If not selected, the week of participation is lost to those student-athletes. This proposal allows the two parts of Bylaw 17 to be synchronized, whereby one postseason contest is both exempted from maximum contest limitations and excluded from the 18 or 19 week playing-season limitation in all sports. It also applies the accommodation to all non-NCAA post-season championship events, not a select few. In sum, it recognizes the value of the post-season championship experience to student-athletes, and provides a fair and consistent application for all sports.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Management Council): The Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal as it conflicts with the reform measures adopted at the 2004 Convention by lengthening the playing and practice season and adding contests for some institutions.

Action: Defeated, 213-87-7. Motion to reconsider defeated 201-183-4.

***NO. 18 (NO. 2-18) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT LENGTH
AND MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS**

Intent: In baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, to add four days of athletically related activity and two dates of competition to the nontraditional segment, as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.9.4, page 133, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.1.9.4 Traditional and Nontraditional Segment Length—Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women's Volleyball. All practice and competition during the nontraditional segment shall be limited to a maximum of five weeks. A maximum of **16 20** days of athletically related activity with no more than four days of athletically related activity in any one week, shall be permitted. *One date* **Three dates** of competition may occur during the nontraditional segment and shall be counted *as one of the 16* **toward the 20** permissible days of athletically related activity. **These dates of competition must occur on a weekend (i.e., Saturday or Sunday).** Any athletically related activity (per Bylaw 17.02.1.1) by any member of the applicable team shall constitute the use of a day."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5, pages 138-139, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.4.5 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to a maximum of 40 contests (games and scrimmages) during the traditional segment, and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.4.5.3.

[17.4.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 40 baseball contests (games and scrimmages) during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

[Remainder of 17.4.5 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.5, pages 148-149, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.10.5 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

“17.10.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of field hockey during the institution’s field hockey playing season in any one year to 20 contests during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.10.5.3, 17.10.5.4 and 17.10.5.5 [see also Bylaw 17.10.3-(a)].

[17.10.5.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.10.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in a maximum of 20 field hockey contests during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition in field hockey during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

[Remainder of 17.10.5 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5, page 160, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.15.5 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

“17.15.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution’s lacrosse playing season to a maximum of 17 dates of competition, with not more than *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.15.5.3, 17.15.5.4 and 17.15.5.5.

[17.15.5.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.15.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 17 dates of competition, with not more than *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

[Remainder of 17.15.5 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.20.5, pages 169-170, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.20.5 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

“17.20.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of soccer during the institution’s soccer playing season in any one year to a maximum of 20 contests during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests and/or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.20.5.3, 17.20.5.4 and 17.20.5.5.

[17.20.5.1.1 through 17.20.5.1.2 unchanged.]

“17.20.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 20 soccer contests during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

[Remainder of 17.20.5 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.21.5, page 171, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.21.5 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

“17.21.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of softball during the institution’s softball playing season to a maximum of 40 contests (games and scrimmages) during the traditional segment, and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.21.5.3.

[17.21.5.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.21.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 40 softball contests (games or scrimmages) with not more than 40 during the traditional segment and *one date* **three dates** of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

[Remainder of 17.21.5 unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.28.8, page 187, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.28.8 Number of Dates of Competition — Women.

“17.28.8.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of women’s volleyball during the institution’s women’s volleyball playing season to a maximum of 22 dates of competition during the traditional segment and *one*

three during the nontraditional segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaw 17.28.10.

[17.28.8.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.28.8.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete—Women. A student-athlete may participate each academic year in a maximum of 22 dates of competition during the traditional segment and *one three* during the nontraditional segment in women’s volleyball. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

[Remainder of 17.28.8 unchanged.]

Source: Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference, Keene State College, Plymouth State University, Rhode Island College and University of Southern Maine.

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: At a majority of public institutions, and many private institutions, the nontraditional season is a time for team tryouts. Many of those tryouts are open to the entire student body per the direction of the president or chancellor and provide an opportunity for all students to participate in intercollegiate athletics. Many of these same institutions require teams (in particular baseball, softball and lacrosse) to fund-raise in support of their programs. The nontraditional season provides the time for a coach to build his or her team and to organize fund-raising initiatives. Outdoor facilities in the fall nontraditional seasons are in the best condition, unlike the many traditional seasons that take place in the spring when facilities are unplayable until April (especially in the north). Students actively involved in campus life are, on average, much more successful and happier than their peers. The retention of incoming freshmen is much higher when those students make a connection to campus life during the first part of their semester. The nontraditional season should allow a coaching staff ample time to properly evaluate students hoping to be student-athletes. An expanded nontraditional segment should give coaching staffs the proper mentoring opportunities necessary to formulate a team, an extension of family. The nontraditional season should also provide ample competitive opportunities for student-athletes to refine their skills under acceptable playing conditions.

Committee Position (Presidents Council and Management Council): The Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal as it is in direct conflict with the reform measures adopted at the 2004 Convention by lengthening the nontraditional segment, adding athletically related activities and contest dates for some sports.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-3) INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL — SELF-STUDY REPORT — FAILURE TO SUBMIT**

Intent: To specify that a member institution that failed to meet the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) deadline shall be placed on probation, restricted status and corresponding membership on repeated failures of submission; further, to specify that the Management Council on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive the deadline if an institution demonstrates extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

Constitution: Amend 6.3.1 by adding new 6.3.1.2, page 44, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“6.3.1 Self-Study Report. Institutions shall conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of their intercollegiate athletics programs at least once every five years, using the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG). The report of the self-study and supporting documentation shall be available for examination on request by an authorized representative of the Association. Subjects covered by the self-study shall include:

[6.3.1-(a) through 6.3.1-(k) unchanged.]

[6.3.1.1 unchanged.]

“6.3.1.2 Failure to Comply with the Institutional Self-Study Guide Deadline. If an institution fails to meet the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) deadline, its entire program (both men’s and women’s sports) shall be placed on probation for one year beginning in the next academic year after the missed deadline. An institution shall be afforded this one-year probationary period for failure to comply with the deadline only once in a 10-year period. The 10-year period shall begin September 1 following the completion of the academic year in which the ISSG deadline is not met.

“6.3.1.2.1 Application of Restricted Membership Status. If an institution fails to complete the ISSG at the end of the probationary year or is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period, it shall be placed in restricted membership per Constitution 3.02.3.1.2.2. If the institution still does not complete the ISSG at the end of that year, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member.

“6.3.1.2.2 Waiver. The Management Council, on the recommendation of the Membership Committee, may grant waivers of Bylaw 6.3.1.2 if it deems that extenuating circumstances warrant such action.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: From 1998 to 2005, 56 Division III institutions failed to submit ISSG Notification of Completion forms to the NCAA national office on time. The submission deadline is significant and needs to be clearly strengthened. This proposal specifies that an institution that fails to meet the ISSG deadline will be notified that it has been placed on probation for one year. Prolonged failure to meet the deadline shall result in restricted and then corresponding membership status. Further, the Management Council may grant a waiver of this requirement when extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

Action: Adopted, 374-24-2.

***NO. 20 (NO. 2-15) FINANCIAL AID — FAILURE TO SUBMIT
ANNUAL ELECTRONIC REPORT —
APPLICATION OF RESTRICTED
MEMBERSHIP STATUS**

Intent: To specify that an institution that fails to submit the annual financial aid electronic report be moved to probation, restricted status and corresponding membership on repeated failures of submission; further, to specify that the Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive the annual financial aid electronic report submission requirement if an institution demonstrates extenuating circumstances warrant such relief.

Bylaws: Amend 15.4.1.1 by adding new 15.4.1.1.2, 15.4.1.1.2.1 and 15.4.1.1.2.2, page 107, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“15.4.1.1 Annual Electronic Report. An institution shall submit an annual electronic report which includes data regarding the financial aid packages awarded by the institution to freshmen and incoming transfer student-athletes and to other incoming students. The format and due date of the electronic report shall be established by the Financial Aid Committee and approved by the Management Council.

“15.4.1.1.1 Late Submission. An institution that submits its annual electronic report after the due date will be subject to a loss of eligibility for championships and Division III strategic initiative grants. The period of ineligibility shall last until the report is submitted.

[15.4.1.1.1.1 unchanged.]

“15.4.1.1.2 Failure to Submit. If an institution fails to submit the annual financial aid electronic report by the conclusion of the academic year during which the report was due, its entire program (both men’s and women’s sports) shall be placed on probation for one year beginning in the next academic year after non-compliance is discovered. An institution shall be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to

comply with submission requirement only once in a 10-year period. The 10-year period shall begin September 1 following the completion of the academic year in which the annual financial aid electronic report is not submitted.

“15.4.1.1.2.1 Application of Restricted Membership Status. If an institution fails to submit the annual financial aid electronic report at the end of the probationary year or is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period, it shall be placed in restricted membership per Constitution 3.02.3.1.2.1. If the institution does not submit the annual electronic financial aid report by the end of that year, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member.

“15.4.1.1.2.2 Waiver. The Management Council, on the recommendation of the Membership Committee, may grant waivers of Bylaw 15.4.1.1.2 if it deems that extenuating circumstances warrant such action.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Due to the importance of the financial aid annual electronic report and its relationship to the Division III philosophy, repeated failure to submit the annual electronic report should result in a loss of Division III membership. This proposal includes a waiver provision whereby the Management Council, based on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may grant a waiver of this requirement when extenuating circumstances warrant such relief. It should be noted that this proposal addresses situations when an institution fails to submit the request for an entire academic year. Existing legislation establishes the penalty for late submission within an academic year as loss of eligibility for championships and Division III strategic initiative grants.

Action: Adopted, 390-9-3.

GENERAL GROUPING

NO. 21 (NO. 2-4) ETHICAL CONDUCT — UNETHICAL CONDUCT — PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Intent: To specify that unethical conduct shall include the knowing involvement in providing a student-athlete a banned substance, impermissible supplement or medications contrary to medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports medicine practice, or state or federal law.

Bylaws: Amend 10.1, page 47, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“10.1 UNETHICAL CONDUCT. Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or a current or former institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:

[10.1-(a) through 10.1-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) Knowingly furnishing the NCAA or the individual’s institution false or misleading information concerning the individual’s involvement in or knowledge of matters relevant to a possible violation of an NCAA regulation; *or*

“(e) Receipt of benefits by an institutional staff member for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or a representative of an agent or advisor (e.g., “runner”). ; **or**

“(f) **Knowing involvement in providing a banned substance or impermissible supplement to student-athletes, or knowingly providing medications to student-athletes contrary to medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports practice, or state or federal law.**”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation does not specify that the act of providing impermissible substances (e.g., prescription drugs) that impact athletics performance is an institutional violation. This proposal will clarify that such an egregious act violates the Association’s ethical conduct bylaw as it is contrary to health and safety of student-athletes. Finally, this proposal would not apply to those student-athletes with a documented medical history demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 22 (NO. 2-5) PERSONNEL — LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS — EXHIBITION CONTESTS

Intent: To permit member institutions to scout opponents participating in exhibition contests.

Bylaws: Amend 11.6, page 50, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“11.6 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS. Member institutions shall not scout any opponents other than those participating in official games **or exhibition contests** (not scrimmages or *exhibition contests*) played during the traditional segment of the playing season.”

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Under current legislation, institutional staff members are not permitted to scout or even attend an exhibition contest in which a feature scheduled opponent is participating. Attending an exhibition contest in which a future opponent is participating provides no discernable competitive advantage thereby rendering the current restriction unnecessary.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council took no position on this proposal. (Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee): The Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee support this proposal, noting that existing scouting legislation prohibits coaches from attending unique exhibition contests against an NCAA Division I or II institution. The scouting prohibition should not apply to exhibition contests as coaches should not be prevented from attending popular, often well-publicized, early or preseason exhibition contests.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 23 (NO. 2-7) RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISITS — MEAL LOCATION

Intent: To specify that meals provided to the prospective student-athlete and the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardians and spouse on an official visit must occur on campus and must be on a scale comparable to normal student life, but may be purchased from on- or off-campus vendors.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.5.6.3, page 74, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“13.6.5.6.3 Meal Location. Meals provided for a prospect and the prospect's parents, legal guardian(s) and spouse on an official visit must occur *in any dining facility located on campus, provided the facility is open to students in general, and*. **It is permissible for the meals to be purchased from off-campus vendors (e.g., restaurants, caterers) as long as the meal is comparable to the type of meal that the prospect would receive if he or she were to enroll as a student at that institution on a scale comparable to normal student life.** If all such **on-campus** dining facilities are closed, the institution may provide meals off-campus. If an institution normally participates in

home competition at a site that is not located on the institution's campus, the meal may occur at that site. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per Constitution 2.8.1."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Institutions have experienced instances where paying the institutional dining facility rate is more expensive than ordering food from a restaurant. With this proposal, these meals still occur on campus, but the institution shall have the discretion to purchase the meal from an off-campus source as long as the meal is consumed on campus and the meal is on a scale comparable to normal student life.

Committee Position (Management Council): Note: If this proposal is adopted, the Management Council intends to implement an immediate effective date at its post-Convention meeting.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 24 (NO. 2-8) RECRUITING — TRYOUTS — COMPETITION AGAINST PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To specify that subvarsity teams may not compete against high-school or preparatory-school teams.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.1.2, page 78, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"13.11.1.2 Competition Against Prospects. An institution's *varsity* intercollegiate team (**e.g., junior varsity or varsity**) may compete against a two-year college team but may not compete against a high-school or preparatory school team. *Subvarsity teams are not bound by this prohibition.* The *varsity* team may participate in a contest against an established outside team that includes prospects, provided the outside team is ongoing and was not established for the specific purpose of competing against the collegiate team."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006 [Note: Contracts between member institutions and high schools or preparatory schools signed prior to January 9, 2006, may be honored].

Rationale: Based on the philosophical premise of Division III tryout regulations, subvarsity and varsity teams should be bound by the same prohibition against competition against high-school or preparatory-school teams. Scheduling challenges for a subvarsity team should not be a reason to allow competition against high school or preparatory school teams.

Action: Referred to Division III Management Council, 213-178-9.
Motion to reconsider referral defeated, 190-188-6.

NO. 25 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING — PROHIBITED EXPENSES — DONATION OF USED ATHLETICS EQUIPMENT

Intent: To permit institutions to donate used athletics equipment to all youth groups, including high schools, according to the institutions' regular policy regarding the discarding of equipment.

Bylaws: Amend 13.15.1.5.1, page 83, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"13.15.1.5.1 Athletics Equipment. A member institution *may not provide athletics equipment to a high school. However, a member institution is permitted to* **may** provide **used** athletics equipment to **high schools or** bona fide youth organizations (e.g., the YMCA, a boy scout troop, a summer recreation league) that may consist of *some* prospects, provided the issuance of equipment is in accordance with the institution's regular policy regarding *the* discarding of equipment. Further, **an institution may only provide** those **high schools or** organizations within a 30-mile radius of the campus *may be provided with* such equipment *by the institution*. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal recognizes the benefit of donating used athletic equipment to youth groups rather than simply discarding it. Institutions are frequently asked to donate their used equipment to youth groups, including high schools; however, the current legislation prohibits donations to high schools. The potential recruiting advantages gained by such a donation are overshadowed by the positive impact it would have on the affected individuals.

Committee Position (Management Council): Note: If this proposal is adopted, the Management Council intends to implement an immediate effective date at its post-Convention meeting.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 26 (NO. 2-14) ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT — CHAMPIONSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who must complete an academic year of residence is not eligible to participate in any NCAA championships during academic year of residence or dur-

ing the vacation period immediately following the academic year of residence.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.1.5, page 97, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“14.5.1.5 *Championship* Eligibility for *Championship in Progress*. A transfer student shall be eligible for any NCAA championship that is in progress after a full calendar year has elapsed and at the time he or she has completed two full semesters or three full quarters of academic work. A transfer student who is required to fulfill an academic year of residence shall not be eligible to participate in any NCAA championship that occurs during the academic year of residence or during the vacation period immediately following the academic year of residence.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: The intent of the transfer residence requirement is for a student-athlete to be withheld from all competition for one full academic year. It is not appropriate for a student-athlete to be eligible for NCAA championships that occur during the vacation period immediately following the conclusion of the transfer residence requirement, since that championship was tied to a season during which the individual was not eligible for other competition.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 27 (NO. 2-16) AWARDS AND BENEFITS — BENEFITS, GIFTS AND SERVICES — PERMISSIBLE — OCCASIONAL MEALS

Intent: To permit a representative of an institution's athletics interests to provide an occasional meal to a student-athlete(s) at any location in the locale of the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 16.11.1.5, page 119, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“16.11.1.5 Occasional Meals. A student-athlete or the entire team in a sport may receive an occasional *family home* meal from an institutional staff member or representative of athletics interests under the following conditions:

“(a) *Institutional staff members may provide* The occasional meals **may be provided at any location in the locale of the institution. *A representative of the institution's athletics interests may only provide occasional meals in an individual's home (as opposed to a restaurant) and may be catered;***

“(b) Meals must be restricted to infrequent and special occasions; and

“(c) Institutional staff members **and representatives of the institution’s athletics interests** may provide transportation to student-athletes to attend such meals. *A representative of the institution’s athletics interests may not provide transportation to student-athletes to attend the meal function unless the meal function is at the home of that representative.*”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This proposal provides the opportunity for student-athletes to receive an occasional meal from a representative of athletics interests in a restaurant, thereby providing additional opportunities for such meals to occur, and institutional discretion as to the location of the meals.

Committee Position (Management Council): Note: If this proposal is adopted, the Management Council intends to implement an immediate effective date at its post-Convention meeting.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 28 (NO. 2-19) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST CONTEST AND PRACTICE DATE — FOOTBALL

Intent: In football, to permit an institution to play its first contest (game) on the Thursday prior to Labor Day in years when the first permissible contest date falls during Labor Day weekend; further, to permit a maximum of 25 practice opportunities before the Friday prior to Labor Day if the institution’s first contest (game) is scheduled for the Thursday prior to Labor Day.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2.1, pages 151-152, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.11.2.1 First Practice Date. A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team before the date that will permit a maximum of 25 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.11.2.1.1) before its first scheduled intercollegiate game **or before the Friday before Labor Day if the institution’s first contest (game) is scheduled for the Thursday prior to Labor Day.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.3 by adding new 17.11.3.1, page 152, as follows:

“17.11.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game) against outside competition in football before the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the Division III Football Championship.

“17.11.3.1 Exception. An institution may play its first

football contest on the Thursday prior to Labor Day in years when the first permissible contest date falls during the Labor Day weekend.”

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: Football scheduling is becoming increasingly difficult for institutions in certain regions of the country. Many of those institutions are forced to travel considerable distances and/or play Division II or non-NCAA opponents in order to fill out their schedules. Allowing institutions to play their first permissible game on the Thursday prior to Labor Day would provide greater flexibility in scheduling which often results in lower costs and less missed class time for student-athletes. Furthermore, for those institutions that find it necessary to schedule Division II opponents, this modification would make the first permissible date for Division III consistent in many years with that for Division II, thereby increasing the opportunities to schedule games closer to home. This change to the first permissible contest date will not result in a lengthening of the playing and practice season inasmuch as the first permissible practice date shall still be counted back from that Friday. It is also important to note that this is permissive legislation enabling an institution to elect to play its first game on a date that results in the least amount of missed class time for its student-athletes and at a considerable cost savings.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council took no position on this proposal. (Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The Management Council and Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee support this proposal, noting it provides limited scheduling flexibility for institutions sponsoring football without increasing the overall length of the playing and practice season. Specifically, the subcommittee noted that this proposal does not move back the first permissible practice date in August.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 29 (NO. 2-20) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS — LACROSSE

Intent: In lacrosse, to amend the maximum contest limitations to include 17 dates of competition in the traditional segment and one date of competition in the nontraditional segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5.1, page 160, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.15.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule against outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution’s

lacrosse playing season to a *maximum of 17 dates of competition, with not more than during the traditional segment and* one date of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.15.5.3, 17.15.5.4 and 17.15.5.5. Further, during the traditional segment, an institution may exclude contests against an alumni team on one date of competition per Bylaw 17.15.5.3-(d).”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5.2, page 160, as follows:

“17.15.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in *each academic year in a maximum of 17 dates of competition with not more than during the traditional segment and* one date of competition during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

Source: Empire 8

Effective Date: August 1, 2006

Rationale: This treats lacrosse consistently and equitably compared to its fellow team sports for dates of competition purposes. It will also rectify a legislative oversight that occurred in 2001 (Proposal No. 50) which modified the nontraditional segment for various sports. That proposal included lacrosse in its initial intent statement but not in the review of edited legislation thus leaving it unchanged. In 2002, Proposal No. 55 was adopted including lacrosse with the nontraditional changes from 2001 but inadvertently reducing the number of contests in the traditional segment. It is important to note that when 2001 Proposal No.50 and 2002 Proposal No. 55 were adopted, lacrosse was the only sport to incur a reduction in its traditional contest limits (contrary to the intent of its sponsor, the New Jersey Athletic Conference). This proposal will make the lacrosse legislation consistent and equitable with other team sports, as the original legislation intended, while still adhering to the limitations of no more than one date of competition in the nontraditional season as adopted by the membership at the 2004 Convention.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council took no position on this proposal. (Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The Management Council and Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee support this proposal, noting that this change supports the consistent treatment of all sports in Division III.

Action: Adopted.

2006 NCAA CONVENTION VOTING GRID -- DIVISION III
(Monday, January 9 -- Business Session)

PROPOSAL NO.	BUSINESS SESSION	RESULT	COUNT (actual count or paddle)
1*	III	Adopted	400-6-0
2	III	Adopted	313-85-6
3	III	Defeated	128-277-1
4	III	Defeated	199-203-4
5	III	Motion to refer to Management Council	367-33-6
6#	III	Adopted	318-84-2
7%	III	Defeated	37-371-3
8%	III	Adopted	233-170-5
9	III	Adopted	403-2-1
10	III	Withdrawn	
11	III	Adopted	391-20-0
12^	III	Motion to refer to NCAA Executive Committee Working Group to Study Membership Issues	371-32-5
13+	III	Adopted	244-148-12
14#	III	Defeated	79-324-4
15	III	Defeated	194-212-3
Call for Vote to Reconsider 15	III	Adopted	254-133-1
Reconsideration of 15	III	Adopted	228-155-2
16#	III	Withdrawn	
17	III	Defeated	187-213-7
Call for Vote to Reconsider 17	III	Defeated	183-201-4
18	III	Withdrawn	

NCAA Division III Convention Voting Grid

January 9, 2006

Page No. 2

PROPOSAL NO.	BUSINESS SESSION	RESULT	COUNT (actual count or paddle)
24	III	Motion to reorder Motion for roll-call vote Motion to refer to Management Council	Approved Approved 213-178-9
Call for Vote to Reconsider Referral of 24	III	Defeated	188-190-6
19	III	Adopted	374-24-2
20	III	Adopted	390-9-3
21	III	Adopted	Paddle
22	III	Adopted	Paddle
23	III	Adopted	Paddle
25	III	Adopted	Paddle
26	III	Adopted	Paddle
27	III	Adopted	Paddle
28	III	Adopted	Paddle
29	III	Adopted	Paddle

* Effective Immediately.

^ Effective Immediately (for provisional or exploratory institutions); June 1, 2006 (for Division I or II institutions that submit reclassification applications on or before June 1, 2006).

+ August 1, 2006, to begin the two-year window for completion of the first self-study; August 1, 2008, for relief of the seven institution minimum and continuity of membership requirements.

Effective August 1, 2007.

% Effective August 1, 2010.

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Adrian College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agnes Scott College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Albion College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Albright College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alfred University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alma College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alvernia College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
American Southwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Amherst College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anderson University (Indiana)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arcadia University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Women's Colleges Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Augsburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Augustana College (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Aurora University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Austin College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Babson College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baldwin-Wallace College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baptist Bible College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bard College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bates College	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Bay Path College	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Becker College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Beloit College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benedictine University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Bernard M. Baruch College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Bethany College (West Virginia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Bethel University (Minnesota)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blackburn College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bluffton University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Brandeis University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Bridgewater State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Brooklyn College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Bryn Mawr College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Buena Vista University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Buffalo State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Cabrini College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California Institute of Technology	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University- East Bay	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Calvin College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Capital University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Carleton College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Carnegie Mellon University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Carthage College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Case Western Reserve University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Castleton State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Catholic University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cazenovia College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cedar Crest College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centenary College (New Jersey)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centennial Conference	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central College (Iowa)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centre College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chapman University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chatham College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chestnut Hill College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City College of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clark University (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clarke College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clarkson University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colby-Sawyer College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College Misericordia	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Mount St. Joseph	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Mount St. Vincent	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of New Rochelle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of St. Benedict	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of St. Catherine	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of St. Scholastica	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Staten Island	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Wooster	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Commonwealth Coast Conference	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia College- Moorhead	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University (Wisconsin)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University at Austin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cornell College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Curry College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Defiance College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Delaware Valley College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denison University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DePauw University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DeSales University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dickinson College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Dominican University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Drew University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
D'Youville College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Earlham College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
East Texas Baptist University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern Mennonite University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern Nazarene College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Elizabethtown College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Elmhurst College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Elmira College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Elms College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emerson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Emory and Henry College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Empire 8	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Endicott College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eureka College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Fairleigh Dickinson University-Florham	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ferrum College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Fitchburg State College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Fontbonne University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Framingham State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Franklin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Frostburg State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gallaudet University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
George Fox University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gettysburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gordon College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Goucher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Great Northeast Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Greensboro College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Greenville College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Grinnell College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Grove City College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Guilford College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gustavus Adolphus College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gwynedd-Mercy College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hamilton College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hamline University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hampden-Sydney College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hanover College		N	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y												
Hardin-Simmons University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Hartwick College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Haverford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

[illegible]

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Macalester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MacMurray College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Manchester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maranatha Baptist Bible College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marian College (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marietta College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marymount University (Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryville College (Tennessee)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryville University of Saint Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marywood University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McDaniel College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McMurry University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Medaille College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Meredith College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Messiah College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Assn	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Corp	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middlebury College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Midwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Millikin University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mills College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Millspass College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Milwaukee School of Engineering	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Monmouth College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montclair State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moravian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Holyoke College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Ida College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount St. Mary College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Union College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nazareth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Neumann College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England Small College Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England Women's & Men's Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey City University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York City College of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Newbury College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Refer Proposal #11	Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Nichols College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Atlantic Conference	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Central College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Coast Athletic Conference	Y	A	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
North Eastern Athletic Conference	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
North Park University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Northland College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Norwich University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Oberlin College	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Occidental College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Oglethorpe University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ohio Athletic Conference	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ohio Northern University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Wesleyan University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Old Dominion Athletic Conf	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Otterbein College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Pacific University (Oregon)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Penn State University- Altoona	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania State Univ - Erie- the Behrend College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Philadelphia Biblical University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Piedmont College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Plattsburgh State University of New York	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Plymouth State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Polytechnic University (New York)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Presidents' Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Principia College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ramapo College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Randolph-Macon College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhode Island College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Rhodes College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Ripon College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Rivier College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Roanoke College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Rochester Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Rockford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Roger Williams University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Rosemont College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Rowan University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Refer Proposal #15	Proposal #15	Refer Proposal #17	Reconsider #24
Russell Sage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rust College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rutgers- The State Univ. of New Jersey- Camden	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rutgers- The State Univ. of New Jersey- Newark	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Joseph's College (Maine)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's College (Indiana)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salem State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salisbury University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salve Regina University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schreiner University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shenandoah University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Simpson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Skidmore College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Skyline Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwestern University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Springfield College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John Fisher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John's University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph's College (Long Island)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Norbert College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Olaf College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Brockport																						
State University College at Cortland		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Fredonia	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Geneseo	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at New Paltz	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Old Westbury	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Oneonta	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Potsdam	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Farmingdale	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Oswego	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Maritime College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stevens Institute of Technology	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Suffolk University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sul Ross State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Susquehanna University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Swarthmore College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Refer Proposal #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Texas Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
The College of New Jersey	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Thomas College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thomas More College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Transylvania University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (District of Columbia)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity University (Texas)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tufts University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Union College (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University Athletic Association	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Chicago	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Dallas	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Dubuque	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of La Verne	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maine- Farmington	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Mary Washington	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Massachusetts- Boston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Massachusetts- Dartmouth	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of New England	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh- Bradford	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh- Greensburg	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Redlands	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Scranton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Southern Maine	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Texas at Dallas	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the South	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Eau Claire	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- La Crosse	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Oshkosh	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Platteville	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- River Falls	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Stevens Point	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Superior	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Whitewater	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ursinus College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA South Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Utica College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vassar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Villa Julie College		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Refer Proposal #5	Proposal #6	Proposal #7	Proposal #8	Proposal #9	Proposal #11	Refer Proposal #12	Proposal #13	Proposal #14	Proposal #15	Proposal #17	Refer Proposal #24	Proposal #19	Proposal #20	Reconsider #15	Proposal #15	Reconsider #17	Reconsider #24
Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wabash College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wartburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Jefferson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Lee University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington College (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington University (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Waynesburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Webster University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wellesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wells College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wentworth Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western New England College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westfield State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westminster College (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westminster College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Whitman College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Whittier College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Whitworth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Widener University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilkes University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Willamette University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
William Paterson University of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Williams College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilmington College (Ohio)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wittenberg University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Worcester State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Yeshiva University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
York College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
York College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Total Yes	400	313	128	199	367	318	37	233	403	391	371	244	79	194	187	213	374	390	254	228	183	188
Total No	6	85	277	203	33	84	371	170	2	20	32	148	324	212	213	178	24	9	133	155	201	190
Total Abstain	0	6	1	4	6	2	3	5	1	0	5	12	4	3	7	9	2	3	1	2	4	6
Total Abscent	9	11	9	9	9	11	4	7	9	4	7	11	8	6	8	15	15	13	27	30	27	31

360,000
student-athletes

1,200
member institutions

88
championships

23
sports

3
divisions

1
association

100
years



1906–2006